

MOTHER GERTRUDE OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT

1822—1904

IT has often been a pleasure to me to try to arouse popular interest in the Lives of Foundresses, such as the Foundress of the Cenacle nuns, and of "Marie-Auxiliatrice," and lately, Mother Cabrini, Foundress of the Missionaries of the Sacred Heart. Among so much of interest, then, which met me when I approached the Eastern Vicariate, in South Africa, a special place was claimed by the "Life" of "Notre Mère," kindly sent to me in anticipation by the Vicar Apostolic himself. I derived so much enjoyment from the memoir of Mother Gertrude of the Blessed Sacrament, everywhere known as "Ma Mère," that I read it without a break—save such as were due to looking at the view from the train windows—and most of what is said of her here is taken from it.¹

Josephine Amélie de Henningsen was born of a remarkable family descended from Scandinavian kings. Indeed, in course of time half the royal blood of Europe got into its veins. The Henningsens were good soldiers, ancestors perhaps suitable for one who was to experience two revolutions (in Belgium, 1830; in France, 1848); two Kaffir wars; and two Anglo-Boer wars. Indeed, her brother, General Charles Frederick de Henningsen of the American Confederate Army, wrote a cheery "History of Filibustering," in which, it is interesting to see, he expresses astonishment at Kingsley's superficiality. I think few save the English can have been so taken in by Charles Kingsley. And one of *Notre Mère's* sisters was engaged to Lord Kitchener's father. Had she married him, I suppose her son would still have become Lord Kitchener . . . it would be interesting to re-read his life, speculating what he would have done had he had all that Viking blood, in addition, in his veins! The children were brought up with almost royal rigour in Brussels, France, and England, and half the great names of Europe flit through the family's memoirs. They settled for quite a long time in

¹ "A Record of the Life and Times of S. M. G. du St-Sacrament; Foundress of the First Community of Nuns in South Africa," by A. O'Riley; with a foreword by the Rt. Rev. H. MacSherry [the present Vicar Apostolic]. Cape Town. Pp. xviii. 380. 1922.

England because of the revolution of 1830, from which they escaped literally through a hail of bullets, which enchanted the little child. She could not stop watching the soldiers loading and re-loading. It is amazing to find that Amélie, whose father, indeed, was Lutheran, though her mother was a very good Catholic, seriously debated before her first Communion whether she would be Protestant or Catholic. It was so much easier to be a good Protestant! But she decided that the Catholic Faith was the "noblest, purest and most self-sacrificing" creed; so she settled down to catechism in earnest, though at the same time she settled that the real panacea for the world's ills was philosophy! A better sort of seriousness beset her when she caught smallpox, through nursing a servant who had it, recovered, and accompanied her mother, also ill, abroad, but seeing her glittering life through other eyes. In 1842, they returned to England, and Comtesse de Henningsen died.

The family was thus broken up. Amélie with one of her sisters went to Paris, and the abrupt conversion during Mass of a friend created a new, profound impression upon Amélie. She resolved to be a nursing sister. But the nun to whom she first confided this diverted her to the ideal of teaching, though teaching had been the one idea of all others that she loathed. She applied to be received into the Congregation of the Assumption nuns, a Congregation well known and prized in England. She made her profession in 1845. Her home-training, and perhaps her having frequently met during this time Lacordaire and Chateaubriand, will have widened her mind; still, they say that the prayers she wrote down when taking her vows were "characteristic of the spirit of all the novices"; they were, certainly, a light upon her own. She prays for the Pope and "God's designs upon him"; for the establishment of Religious Orders everywhere, but especially in France and England: for the conversion of England; the accomplishment of God's designs regarding Poland, Ireland, Spain, the Caucasus, Hungary, Texas; the conversion of Lamennais and Buzet; the accomplishment of the Pope's wishes with regard to the Lombard States: for the success of the Missions, especially China, Madagascar, Oregon, Ceylon! This novitiate was kept wisely and well informed! Indeed, on Thursdays, the Annals of the Propagation of the Faith were read aloud. Some Sisters said they could never leave their country for the missions. Sister Gertrude, as she

now was, asked how, if all had felt like that, anyone would have been converted. After recreation she was sent for. "Did you really mean that?" "Yes." "Then will you go to Singapore?" "Of all the nations in the world, I had least liking and sympathy for the Chinese!" But, of course, she accepted. However, this idea fell through; and in 1848, Dr. Devereux, first Vicar Apostolic of the Eastern District of the Cape Province, came to ask for nuns. Four Sisters were chosen, Sister Gertrude among them. "An English Colony was distasteful to me, the next thing to the Chinese mission. But I must accept. I have lived to see that no country offers so much personal, religious, and political liberty as those under English rule." That is pleasant to hear. The next weeks were spent in very practical preparation. Not only did she beg for all sorts of church furniture—she still might do so in South Africa! At a meeting of the "Archconfraternity of Work for Poor Churches" in Port Elizabeth, I heard of a priest who recently had but a *curtain* for humeral veil, and had only the *lining* of a cope to use at Benediction—but the emigrants had a course of training how to teach in poor schools; and again, in simple medicine. She went to London, too, to beg, and did very well. Wiseman applauded her for her courage in wearing her nun's dress in the street. She met Newman, Ward, and other inspiring men: the convert Duchess of Leeds struggled to keep her in England to found a school there; she could not, however, bring herself to go to Mass in the old French chapel she had known, nor even look at the house where she had lived. She feared lest she should weaken. But it is good to know that she *could* weaken; for only in such weakness is strength made perfect; and afterwards, may be, she will seem almost too naturally "strong." She returned to listen to Devereux explaining how vast was the prospect of her mission; Livingstone had just opened up enormous fields: prejudice and "antiquated methods" must be got rid of. The mother-house, therefore, agreed that she should open a poor school; attend the sick; and do all other works of charity that the Bishop might desire. On the other hand, the Superior General wanted Government letters from Paris to be sent to the Governor of the Cape of Good Hope, asking that the new house be "under French protection" so that it might "preserve that national French character which the Congregation desires to maintain in Cape Colony." So far adrift may voyage the imaginations of those

who rule only from afar ! Without any intentions of making thus an "enclave" in her mission-world, Sister Gertrude with her companions, and, by a charming coincidence, Bishop Pompallier of New Zealand, and a party of yet other nuns, and, of course, Bishop Devereux and priests or ecclesiastical students who were afterwards to make noble reputations in South Africa, sailed down the Scheldt in the "Océanie," on August 27, 1849. Forthwith the ship became a school—English, French, Flemish, Dutch, German, Maori were being studied, and at intervals they received ovations from the towns they passed. But peace reigned not for long . . .

Already they had received some incense to quell the "stench of the bilge-water" : already the doctor, O'Rourke, had refused to visit the sick nuns : "Tell them I'm smoking" : already the captain, Radon, had been heard to say : "At present I let them do as they like; they have all they want to eat and drink ; but wait till we are out at sea, and I will show them who is master. ." Bishop Devereux had stipulated merely for "good keep," without specifying so much as three meals a day, let alone fresh meat or *vin ordinaire*. Only when the Bishop threatened to disembark his whole flock at Dover, did Radon provide three meals. Even then he watered the wine and also "put bad spirits into it" ; the American salt provisions were so bad that the very crew mutinied ; once a day only was a piece of meat the size of a 5 franc piece given to each of the missionary group. Pompallier dared not complain ; neither had *he* stipulated for fresh meat, and was sailing twice as far at lower cost per head. By the time they reached the Bay, the water was undrinkable ; at Teneriffe, cholera prevented their landing ; at Porto Praya, Santiago, they landed, and sat down, only to be chased on board again because a few days before an American crew had carried off some women from that island. And on board, that mutiny had at last broken out : the ringleader was about to be fired on when a priest snatched the musket from the soldier's hand. . . The bishop had ordered the nuns to lie flat, lest shots went wild ; but "Notre Mère," as henceforward she will be called, refused, and "knew not what fear was." A whale was captured—they lived on whale-meat : a slaver sailed up close, and seemed about to board the "Océanie," but sheered off at the sight of her guns. The Cape was rounded amid storms, and off the coast, much too far east, it was found that the Captain had lost his reckoning—"he measured his position on the

chart with a tea-spoon." Assisted by a brig that encountered him, he put back, ran into mist, anchored where the bishop, who knew Algoa Bay backwards, told him to; so near to rocks that next day through the mist they could hear birds singing, though they saw no land. Finally, Dr. Devereux got on shore, and after a while, managed to get the rest of his party landed too, on December 3, 1849, feast of St. Francis Xavier. They had been over 3 months at sea!

When Father Devereux had first come to Africa (1837), he had taught in a small school at Cape Town where Dr. Griffith was the first Vicar Apostolic over the whole of South Africa. It is charming to recall that in those days priests were not only long-black-coated, but wore black gloves and huge top-hats, so that on one occasion at least when Father Devereux was being rowed across to attend to passengers on emigrant ships, he was nearly swamped and had to use his hat to bale out the water. So everything has its uses after all. In 1845 or 1846 he was sent to Grahamstown to replace a Father Murphy, then in Europe negotiating for the division of the Vicariate into east and west; with the result that in 1847, Father Devereux was consecrated Bishop and first Vicar Apostolic of Eastern South Africa. He endeared himself both to military and to natives; when he arrived, there were only 3 missions in the whole of his enormous territory, which stretched indefinitely northwards into a savage and ever-threatening world; 100,000 Kaffirs, he reckoned, lived within it; and in a single year he could expect 10,000 immigrants. In 1850, he did, indeed, succeed in getting the Natal Vicariate formed; but it can be guessed how colossal was the work in which the Sisters now had to take their share.

Four waggons, each drawn by 16 oxen, just as you still may see, transported the nuns and the rest of the party on the 6 days' trek from Port Elizabeth to Grahamstown, which you now do in less than a night, having to use for tea or coffee such muddy water as rare puddles supplied. In that heat, the iron of the waggons burned their fingers; traces of leopard and jackal kept pace with them. They got *one* bath, in a pool, not having had enough water from Monday to Saturday in which to wash their hands. They were at first entertained by an admirable woman, never to be forgotten—Mrs. Ford, who, with her children, was a convert from Unitarianism. She herself had been teaching small Catholics; but was unselfishly ready to make her school over to the nuns. On

January 12, 1850, they were able to move into a small house of their own, and this is the birthday of the Convent of Our Lady of Good Hope, the first Convent in South Africa. Grahamstown was not yet afforested. Neither gum nor pine nor blackwood made the dense shade through which I have driven. Seven thousand people lived there in 750 houses. It was founded in 1812 as a military dépôt. When A. F. Cole wrote "The Cape and the Kaffirs," in 1852, he was to say that St. Patrick's church was the "only decent building in the town." The Church of England, said he, formed the aristocratic section; the Wesleyans, the serious one which pitied others for their worldliness; the Baptists were intellectuals; the Independents, radicals, always getting up scenes at public meetings. . The Catholics couldn't be "classed"; but, he said, they seemed to make more "genuine" converts than the rest. Education grovelled. Mrs. Ford's school alone kept up a high standard. No wonder. Her *thought* was such, that when her daughter married a clergyman, and he decided to teach his Unitarian mother-in-law about the Trinity, she listened, and said: "Having heard some, I must hear all. I will enquire from the Church off which you broke so long ago." And her *determination* was such that, to ensure her children a refined education despite their pioneering life, she taught them the piano on a painted key-board, so that when they actually met a piano, they could play almost at once. . She taught her sons needlework and even shoemaking. . No wonder she sent education soaring in early Grahamstown. Generously subordinating herself (as she had promised) to the new Convent, and helping it not a little personally, she and it, together, remain true inaugurateors of education in the city that became chosen for the Rhodes University. Other schools sprang up: being undenominational, they received specially large grants: not that their neutrality was more than nominal. Anyway, at that time, no breath of the great European culture reached that district save through the Convent, where Ma Mère, and afterwards her sister, taught French, German, Italian, the harp and the guitar. . English was helped out by the daughter of the Anglican Colonial chaplain, who almost at once became a convert and a postulant. The harp, with its poor broken strings, that I tried to twang, still stands in a corner of the reception room. . The school thrrove, though Wesleyans begged the nuns, in the streets, to trust in Christ, and thrust tracts through the windows. . It opened three days

after they moved in—with 100 in the free school, over 30 in the day and boarding schools, but numbers rose rapidly, about a third in the free school, and over a half in the boarding or day school, being Protestants. To-day, the nuns teach some 130 in the native and coloured school; about 110 in the primary (church) school; and have, I think, about 40 in their high school, other houses having opened, of course, in the Vicariate, and new teaching institutes appeared.

But in that very year, 1850, during Christmas vespers, news came of the Kaffir¹ massacres at "Auckland, Woburn and Juanasburg," and appalling days ensued. The Kaffirs had "eaten meat," and Grahamstown, which had already experienced something of the sort in 1846, now had to accept and feed perhaps 10,000 refugees. From the hills, blazing villages were on all sides seen. Impossible even to outline the days that followed, though the Kaffirs did not actually attack the town. The Sisters were asked to open an orphanage, and did so, starving themselves for the children; bread had to be made of pumpkins and potatoes; and even a potato cost fourpence. . The Convent and school, being thatched, were a ready prey for fire; so the church was barricaded; the nuns, devoured by fleas, slept there with the panic-stricken refugees, and spent the day visiting the sick, nursing the wounded, and laying out the dead. Imaginations were racked by incidents such as the fate of the man who had made the first Community table—he was taken alive, scientifically dissected, and while he was still living his heart was removed; it was then eaten. The Sisters had guns—a Capt. McDonald had given Ma Mère his cavalry sword—she knew how to use it, having practised broad-sword with her brother as a girl! Only a quince hedge, beyond a strip of garden, separated the Community-room with its glass door from the place where the Kaffirs were established. She says that at night they would peer through the panes as she sat writing. .

After the war, much had to be reconstructed. A project to build a hospital fell through. The orphanage became an incubus—ultimately it was arranged that the children should be boarded out with good Catholic families, taught gratis at the school, and either pay for their keep by such work as they could do, or, if they could do none, be paid for by charity

¹ I use the popular word "Kaffir," and not "Bantu," because it was used then. It is in itself impertinent, and negative, meaning "Unbeliever," and of Mohammedan origin.

through the nuns. Ma Mère decided, later on, that this was a better plan in itself, and indeed I have heard this argued, for interesting reasons, in England. Need I say, the nuns were shirking no labour ! Perched on swaying ladders, they painted their own windows ; they upholstered armchairs ; built chests-of-drawers ; had brought out quantities of cloth cut up into vast veils to hide their sea-stained purple dresses—and avoid the customs . . and now used these to make clothes for the clergy when they could no more turn their old ones ! Meanwhile, for reasons considered sufficient, the connection with the Paris Congregation had been severed, and they became an independent Community. Undoubtedly, had they left the continent, the whole work of religious Communities in South Africa would have been retarded by half a generation if not more.

On February 11, 1854, Bishop Devereux died. His successor, Dr. Moran, did not arrive till November, 1857. Meanwhile, that iron-muscled priest, Father Murphy, famous throughout that land for his inseparable and no less indefatigable horse, could express his disapproval of the nuns. He changed his mind later on ; but he was old-fashioned ; did not like nuns that left their cloister, and could not bear "foreign" devotions. He wrote letter after letter of denunciation, all of which Dr. Moran tore up unread on his arrival. Father Murphy also wrote to Rome . . Ma Mère had been ordered horse-exercise by the doctor (nuns still may have to ride, on out-missions, just as in England they are learning to drive motor-lorries. We surmise that both occupations can be quite good for them.) The Cardinal Prefect of Propaganda replied that he had been "amused" by Father Murphy's scruple. Had he never heard of St. Teresa and her mule ? Dr. Moran himself used afterwards to ride 15 miles daily to say Mass for Ma Mère when she was forced to live for awhile at a distance, recuperating ; he returned to ring the midday angelus. . Father Ricards, under whose ægis Ma Mère had taken her rides, succeeded Dr. Moran when he was transferred to Dunedin (1870).¹ Under the new Vicar Apostolic, Catho-

¹ Ricards's neighbour had been a Mr. O'Reilly. This gentleman, having gone to the Orange River, saw the children of a Dutch farmer playing with "bright stones" ; he sent one back to a Dr. Atherstone who had taken his house. "Was it a gem?" Atherstone had dropped this stone into the grass ; he found it, took it next door to Dr. Ricards, who had a reputation for omniscience. Ricards cut his initials with it on a window-pane, still preserved. Yes—it was a diamond. Well, I suppose the disastrous things had to be discovered in

lic work developed rapidly. Ma Mère was a true fairy-godmother to the Jesuits, both when they arrived to take charge of St. Aidan's College, first intended for a seminary, and when in 1879 they went on their first expedition into what is now Rhodesia. So far as she could, she helped, too, the Trappists when they originally undertook agricultural work at Dunbrody—afterwards they went to Natal. Her interest in the Basuto-land missions was constant. A most cultivated old lady, Mrs. Schreiner, mother, I understand, of the well-known novelist, came to spend her all-but last years in the little cottage by the Convent gate; she shared with Ma Mère an absolute cult for Cecil Rhodes. Quaint contrast. He and the nun had dreams that were on an imperial scale: he sought money, not for its sake nor for luxury, but for what he could do with it: she renounced it, for the sake of doing even more without it. He told the author of her memoir that he would not think of marrying and having children—for how could he then run the risks he needed to? She, too, abdicated the human right to marriage, that she might become the ancestress of many a spiritual generation. In 1893, it was decided that new Superiors must be chosen for the three teaching-Congregations of South Africa; in the same year, Bishop Ricards died, and was succeeded by Dr. Strobino. In 1896, he sent Mother Gertrude home, to negotiate for the reunion of her Convent with the parent-house—when she arrived in Paris, the Sister porter, appalled by her great stature, deep voice, and the long staff she needed to use, took her for a man disguised and fled in terror. She returned to the Mission, and after suffering dreadful pain, during which she made her own the traditional words: "Burn *here*; cut *here*!" she died, aged 82, on November 1, 1904.

Approaching St. Helena, I had been haunted by the morose spectre of Napoleon. For what visions had he not abdicated his Christian crown? Between that island and the Cape, Cecil Rhodes loomed up. He had not even abdicated. He practically affirmed that to him, the British Empire had stood for what the "Kingdom of God" means to "you Catholics," and was to sigh that he would give all he had, could he but

South Africa some day. Would that the bishop could have baptized away their maleficence. This at least is how the Memoir relates the tale. The end is accurate: but the earlier history of the diamond was much longer than that. It went through various hands before it reached O'Reilly, and he did not send it at once to Atherstone.

believe "all that that old man does"—it was General Booth. Even after a month of South Africa, several personalities have—not obsessed me, as those two did, but at least intrigued me; among others, this gracious and refined, this valiant and indomitable woman—dare I say that at moments I have half wanted to say this "truculent" woman—see her, sword drawn, marching her protégés to their refuge! see her being taken, more than once, for a man disguised . . yet who earned for herself as supremely appropriate, the title of "Ma Mère"! But more than that. She at once encountered, and transmitted, all the chief problems that beset us still. Is Africa given by God to the blacks, and is every white an interloper? There are natives now who loudly proclaim it. Or again, what will you do with the Native? exterminate him? The Bushman is no more, and the Hottentot has practically had his knock-out. Segregate him? Who can segregate thought? and now the Bantu thinks. Repress him? refuse him enough land? equal education? a modicum of franchise? "One man can hold another down in the ditch; but only at cost of staying there himself." Convert him? To what? Christianity? which of the warring sects is preaching it? will agriculture do as a substitute? is the "raw" native better than any brand of Christians? They said so, in Ma Mère's day. Fewer, but many, say so now.—And Education on a narrower scale—in the "white" world. . Nearly half Ma Mère's pupils were non-Catholics. To-day, sometimes more than half of a "Catholic" school is Protestant. Useful? inevitable? disastrous?—And kind of education? Afrikaans is ousting Latin, even French. Does this more unite South Africa within itself, or less unite it with the world in general? How much of Ma Mère's schooling, with its Italian, its harp, its water-colours, would she recognize in the education of to-day? Little enough. Regrettable? matter for congratulation? She witnessed the splendid sunrise of the Jesuit and Trappist enterprises: she welcomed whole-heartedly the Irish Dominican nuns on their arrival. Have Catholic missions gone the way she would have expected? I expect nothing has gone the way she expected! Has it gone better? let us hope so. Anyhow, to look at South Africa through her eyes, makes it a hundred times more interesting to look at it, afterwards, through our own.

C. C. MARTINDALE.

CATHOLIC INTOLERANCE

"O Timothy, keep the Deposit."—*I Tim.*

IN a striking and very useful paper published in THE MONTH for June, Dom J. B. McLaughlin pointed out how the God of Truth during His life on earth as Man, whilst kind and gentle with those whose ignorance was inculpable, was rigidly severe with those who had the opportunity of learning the truth, and refused it. Having come on earth to testify to the truth He could not tolerate any persistence in error in those to whom He made His revelation. "If I had not come and spoken to them they would have no sin: now they have no excuse for their sin." The Church which Christ founded must needs condemn as He did those that shut their eyes to the light. Her true children must detest heresy and show themselves keen to detect it.

Of all the religious catchwords now in fashion there is none more insidious than the epithet "broad-minded"—insidious because, rightly used, it connotes an admirable quality, viz., a disposition, in open questions, to consider sympathetically points of view not one's own. But when applied to revealed truth "broad-mindedness" too often stands for a refusal of intellectual obedience or a flabby indifference to the claims of evidence, a comprehensive vagueness, a lazy indecision, the easy part of Mr. Facing-both-Ways. Or it is a constructive denial that Christ has come and spoken to us in such a way as to make doubt or indifference gravely sinful.

True broad-mindedness will readily recognize the fact of widespread delusion, causing its victims to believe sincerely in falsehoods or even absurdities, but it will avoid condoning these falsehoods or absurdities as in some way on a level with truth, and cheerfully brave the charge of intolerance and uncharitableness which its intransigence is sure to inspire in the falsely broad-minded. Rigid devotion to revealed truth springs from a real width of vision which comprehends God's claims and is loyal to God's purposes, whereas the man who is "broad-minded" in the wrong sense is in reality so narrow that he cannot even understand the detestable character of error, those errors always excepted that might injure his own material interests. Accordingly,

when a man is praised by the secular press as a "broad-minded" or "moderate" Roman Catholic, he has as much reason to examine his conscience as had O'Connell "praised by *The Times*," a century since.

To take an example or two: St. Thomas Aquinas shows his breadth of mind when, in his incomparable *Summa*, he states the enemy's case with perfect clarity before demolishing it; and Newman's share in this great quality gave rise to Huxley's hyperbole about compiling a primer of infidelity from Newman's writings. Newman illustrates our case the better in that he very occasionally lapsed, in utterances not addressed to the public, into the human weakness of narrowness or prejudice, and it was precisely then that the world, on coming to hear of them, *more suo*, loudly applauded his breadth of mind. I refer of course to a few regrettably unfair criticisms of Manning, Veuillot, and the Ultramontanes generally.

True broad-mindedness enables men to rise superior to the universal prejudices of their time. In the seventeenth century Fr. Spee's wide vision saw that many accusations of witchcraft were quite unjust. Again, in our own day, M. Sangnier shows a most courageous breadth of mind in his appreciation of German as well as French patriotism, and his heroic efforts in face of an unChristian nationalism to promote reconciliation. We may venture to suggest that it would have been well for this country had she taken into account in the last generation the wide vision of a Wilfrid Blunt (who foretold that her pride of Empire would be England's tomb), or paid more sincere heed to a Ripon or a Gordon. But no fair-minded man can applaud as wise tolerance of possible good the connivance of British politicians in the Satanism of Russia's misrulers, while they affect to be scandalized by the exercise of Catholic discipline in Malta. Only full-blooded phrases like Carlyle's "putrescent cant" could do justice to that attitude, and precisely because they are full-blooded and very definite, your spineless modern will dub them "narrow-minded." The mental coinage of the time is indeed debased.

To return to the question of religion. Here especially it is our duty to mark very definitely the limits of tolerance, if we are to be loyal to the Faith entrusted to us. We are surrounded by religious bodies whose rule of faith is ultimately their own private judgment, for none of them, not even the

"highest" Anglican, admits a living and infallible Authority in religion. Consequently it would be the height of intellectual arrogance for any member of these sects to say that he alone possessed the truth and that all who differed from him were in error: common politeness enjoins mutual tolerance. But Catholics, basing their belief on God's living Oracle, the Church, must denounce as wrong and harmful everything contrary to her teaching. They must be as intolerant towards false beliefs as was their Master Christ. Their breadth of mind is shown by a ready admission that multitudes of non-Catholics, who have had no real chance of learning the truth, are in good faith, and that even "Anglo-Catholics," who have had the grace to see the more patent errors of Protestantism may yet be blind to the claims of the true Church. But it is not "broad-mindedness" to tolerate their pretensions, still less to foster and flatter their delusions, on the plea that they are leavening the Protestant mass around them and preparing England to return to the Faith. Such a policy savours of doing evil that good may result, even if there were real evidence that it would be successful. On the contrary, speaking objectively, "Anglo-Catholics" are more to blame than their more Protestant fellows, because, having seen the need of Authority in religion, they will not recognize it where alone it exists.

The late Father Gallwey's "Twelve Lectures on Ritualism," delivered as long ago as 1874, were a searching indictment of the thoroughly Protestant pride informing its superficially "Catholic" tendencies. In his later work, "Watches of the Passion," he touches incidentally upon it while treating of Pilate's vacillation. "How many are there at this day who wish, in a way, to arrive at truth! They could have it at once if they would become docile and listen to the infallible teaching of Christ's Apostles; but this appointed method, plain, easy, and sure, they will not adopt; yet they are ready to study and read Church history, to travel and look at the Eastern Church, to put themselves in communication with the Old Catholics of Germany: this state of mind represents the second class in St. Ignatius' meditation on the Three Classes; the men who are ready to do many things for salvation, but *not the one thing necessary.*"¹

The inventors and refurbishers of the myth of "continuity" are past-masters in the art of appealing to intellectual pride.

¹ "Watches of the Passion," Ed. 6, 1897; Vol. II., pp. 97-98.

But there are many whom lack of education or distaste for history makes deaf to this appeal. With them another way is taken, an appeal especially searching is made; they are told that, if they abandon Anglicanism, they themselves, or, what weighs immeasurably more with the best of them, their families, will lose their livelihood; their parents will be killed with grief. Surely, then, it is urged, their duty is to stay where they are. We have known this cruel, and in the circumstances, devilish argument employed, and we fear that its use is too common. Yet, later on in the same work,¹ this mean attempt to stifle the conscience of Anglicans who surmise the truth but are dismayed at the cost of confessing it, we find admirably answered. "*They saw the stone rolled away.* So shall it be with us if we do not allow ourselves to be duped by Satan, but persevere and go forward. The great stone that we saw in the distance has, we find, when we reach the spot, been rolled away. . . . 1. 'If I become a Catholic, who will furnish me with bread?' Jesus answers meekly: *Behold the birds of the air. Your Father in Heaven feedeth them. Are not you of much more worth than they?* (Matt. vi.). 2. 'If I enter the Church, it will break my mother's heart, and how shall I live after that?' Jesus answers with compassion: 'If I call you, I am responsible. Shall evil come to you or to your mother through My act, because I call you?'"²

Two years before Father Gallwey's "Twelve Lectures," Father Henry Augustine Rawes expressed his conviction in very grave words: "Even now we can see how men in the different sects outside the Roman Church blind themselves and will not see the light, and stop their ears that they may not listen to the voice that calls them. There are multitudes, indeed, ever coming into the Church, but they are few compared with the benighted myriads who choose to perish in their unbelief. There are always thousands sinning against the light."

It is, of course, permitted us to take a more hopeful view of the relative numbers of the culpably and inculpably ignorant, but this grave judgment, shared by a number of holy servants of God, should be pondered by those easy optimists

¹ "Watches of the Passion," Vol. II., p. 627.

² It cannot be amiss here to call attention to the "Converts' Aid Society," which is one of the organizations providentially brought into existence to meet this special need. It is indeed what the present Holy Father called it, a "most delicate and exquisite charity." See "The Cost of Conversion" (C.T.S.).

who imagine that twelve thousand yearly conversions, more or less, are bringing about this country's return to the Faith. That twelve thousand souls in any land should enter the Church is indeed a great mercy of God, but, as for the conversion of England, twelve thousand is but an insignificant number compared with England's population, and, we pray God, it may not be greatly outbalanced by the yearly leakage.

It is remarkable that in 1930, the year when the Lambeth Conference, to the amazement of Christendom, abandoned the traditional morality of Christianity, the number of conversions in London was somewhat less than in 1929, and there has been a perceptible hardening of the Anglican heart since the failure of the manœuvres at Malines and Amay.

With regard to the question of good faith, it is quite clear that it would be a sin against charity to judge individuals, except in the case of those who have publicly admitted that their real convictions and their present churchly allegiance do not tally. On the other hand, it would seem to be erroneous to speak of the Holy Spirit using an heretical movement (one, moreover, that aims above all things at preventing conversion to the Church of God by pretending to provide a substitute) as a means of transition or bridge from heresy to Catholicism. God can always bring good out of evil, but it is unreasonable to suppose that an active heresy, ever busily intriguing, now with this, now with that enemy of Rome, and seeking to hoodwink Catholics ignorant of the relevant facts, indefatigable in falsifying history and increasingly shameless in its attempts to personate the Catholic Church and steal her name, can meet the divine tolerance as actuated by mere invincible ignorance or blundering goodwill.

No one possessed of any historical sense and familiar with the modes and manœuvres of continental history can be satisfied with such easy catchwords as "they are *all* in good faith. Leave them alone and they'll come home, etc." That is the very thing they are determined not to do, and their literature often abounds with tortuous evasions, suppressions, and manipulations objectively incompatible with straightforward dealing. When any cause is thought to need the help of subterfuge, or even, as Luther said, "a good thumping lie," it may fairly be concluded that the confidence of its upholders is precarious. Perhaps the best commentary on

this matter is that furnished, just before the war, by a very gifted, widely-read, widely-travelled, and widely-acquainted authoress, whose writings deserve much fuller recognition by Catholics than they have received.

The Church and her teachings are, as far as can be judged from contemporary writings, utterly unknown to everyone outside of her own communion. Again and again I have picked up articles written by men of known learning, professors, clergymen, men of letters, whose names are almost household words, that set forth, with all complacency and assurance—not as statements about which there might be some reasonable doubt, but as facts so well known as to admit of no further question—such appalling lies (there is no other word for it) that one is driven at times to the point of wondering if it is an epidemic from which they are suffering, a disease which they have caught unconsciously and in spite of themselves. On most other subjects they are sane; on other questions which they undertake to discuss they are informed—they must be, or else how could they have arrived at their present eminence? Yet, for the discussion of this admittedly the most intricate of studies, and one for the understanding of which a lifetime of labour is hardly sufficient, they never appear to feel the need of any sort of serious preparation. In the same way, while they will rigorously adhere to facts elsewhere, refraining manfully from entangling comment, here they seem to lose all sense of moral obligations in the direction of effectual research, and naturally kindly as many of them are, they become simply venomous. Naturally accurate and conscientious, they develop a spirit of vicious speculation which amounts to a possession. . . . And the fact that the calumniators are, some of them, men of blameless private life, or of unquestionable mental integrity in their own work, makes them all the more difficult to reach, for the pride which those private virtues engender is a horribly thick armour to penetrate.¹

My own experience has taught me that it is characteristic of the self-styled "broad-minded" to pass over with perfect equanimity whatever Anglican or other enemies of the Church may say or do, no matter how startling its effrontery,

¹ Mrs. Hugh Fraser, "Italian Yesterdays" (1914), xxi., pp. 349—351.

whereas the moment any Catholic begins a counter-attack, or evinces the least indignation, they are at once up in arms to denounce him as "narrow-minded," "bigoted," "anti-quated," and what not. The Holy See itself is not spared if its utterances traverse the war-propaganda, or Parisian Mason-dictated fashions, in favour with them for the time being. Such spurious "charity" be far from us. Rather let us be narrow-minded and old-fashioned enough to remind the Church's enemies of truths they are bent upon forgetting.

"Take away the Catholic Church out of the world, and then where would Anglicanism be? Well, it would not be at all. All that Anglicanism possesses is borrowed and broken, like stolen goods which are effaced to avoid ownership; bits of doctrine, shivered dogmas, diluted formularies, shorn sacraments, empty temples, married bishops, no Head. This is the English Religion."¹

It is only by avoiding clear definitions and scorning necessary conclusions that these spurious Catholics can maintain their precarious position. An answer to an "Enquiring Layman"² is couched as follows: "If he could claim the right to call himself Christian, he must be baptized, he must in all sincerity subscribe to the Christian creeds, and he must submit to the authority of the Church." But nothing is said about how the creeds are to be understood and where authority—to rule, to define, to guarantee, to interpret—is to be found outside the Catholic and Roman Church.

We, who hold and must trade with the precious Talent of Faith, must risk the charge of intolerance because we do not leave people alone in their religious errors. It must be annoying to English Gallios to have in their midst such an institution as the Catholic Truth Society or to find our papers devote such an amount of space to propaganda. Our non-Catholic friends often don't want to be reminded of the other life and its dread alternatives: they resent the helping hand or the directing voice which we offer them. And because of that resentment there are Catholics who would sit mum, allow sleeping dogs to lie—in every sense, and practise the policy of living and letting live. Such Catholics have mistaken their vocation. St. Paul with his *importune, oppor-*

¹ A. Marshall, "The English Religion: Letters Addressed to an Irish Gentleman" (Dublin: M. Glashon & Gill), p. 55; 1876.

² In *The Outline*, Jan. 21, 1928.

tune, would not approve of them. We belong to the Church Militant, and there is no truce in her warfare.

To consider once again that fatal Resolution XV., of the Lambeth Conference. Some people find, or think they find, it "a help" to break the 6th (or 7th) commandment, and even the natural law, whereupon the "authorities," being consulted, have declared that where the commandment or law in question is found to press *too* hardly it may be violated, provided this is done "on Christian principles"! Should then the Pope be thought narrow-minded or intolerant, for having denounced that violation in unequivocal terms as "a deed which is shameful and intrinsically vicious"? In the hour of that shameful decision the Elizabethan Establishment, as we have implied, finally forfeited any just claim to the respect of believing Christians, any right to be considered as a teaching Christian body. These are not wild or heated words but the calm enunciation of a very important truth, which "broad-minded" disloyalty would Burke. A secular parallel may help us. What would be said of an ostensibly loyal English magistrate who should proclaim that the King's coinage may be defaced and outraged provided this is done "on loyalist principles"? The magistrate would not be a whit more absurd or frivolous than the notorious majority at Lambeth in 1930. If any importance were attached by the nation to truth in religion this would be seen at once.

I have written "broad-minded disloyalty" advisedly. Sentimental shirking of disconcerting facts commonly reveals itself in times of crisis as the beginning of treason. And there are those who already carry it to that extreme. Within the last few months I have heard of two definite instances of "broad-minded" Catholics helping "Anglo-Catholics" to prevent conversions. (I have reason to believe that this is more common than most are willing to admit.) If that is not high treason to Christ the King, words have no meaning. Such "broad-minded" Catholics are enemies within the gate and should be reckoned as such. It was the "broad-minded" who lost England for the Faith in the reign of Elizabeth; it is the "broad-minded" who now help the enemy to prevent her return.

H. E. G. ROPE.

THE "HAPPY FAULT" OF ADAM¹

THE expressions used by holy Church in the Missal and sacred liturgy are carefully chosen always. Though not exact theological definitions, though sometimes rhetorical and poetical, rather than scientific; yet, never is the truth of Catholic doctrine compromised or obscured by liturgical terms of expression. Still, it sometimes happens, with liturgy as with holy Scripture, that passages, when truncated or taken out of their context, are misunderstood and misinterpreted. For example, on Holy Saturday, when blessing the Paschal Candle, the Church sings of Adam's Fall as a "happy fault": "O necessary, O happy fault of Adam." This easily might be misunderstood, only that at the same time the Church gives her reason for this joyful exclamation, viz., not because Adam sinned, but because his fall enriched the coming of Our Divine Lord with additional tenderness—with a grander manifestation of love and mercy through the truly amazing copiousness of redemption. The whole passage must be taken—"O how admirable is thy goodness towards us! O how inestimable is thy love! Thou hast delivered up thy Son to redeem a slave. O truly necessary sin of Adam, which the death of Christ has blotted out! O happy fault, that merited such and so great a Redeemer!"

So sings holy Church! We see at once how well such joyous sentiments endorse or at least harmonize with the "higher view of the Incarnation" (as St. Francis of Sales calls the view), taken by Duns Scotus and his followers, by Suarez and a host of other theologians, both ancient and modern, particularly Franciscans and Jesuits; viz., that the Incarnation formed part of God's eternal design in creating the universe; so that, in due time, Our Divine Lord would have become incarnate of the Virgin Mary, for the exaltation of the entire universe, even though man had never fallen: and the sin of Adam imparted to the Incarnation its expiatory character and more wonderfully manifested God's infinite love and mercy.²

¹ [The following brief article was prompted by a question and answer printed in *The Catholic Gazette* of June, 1931.]

² Without giving the scriptural, patristic, and theological arguments supporting this widely-accepted Scotistic view of the Incarnation, I merely refer readers

It is at the mercifulness of this remedial character of the Incarnation, *occasioned* by Adam's fall, that holy Church rejoices, not only in the passage already quoted, but all through the thrilling "Exultet" sung by the deacon on Holy Saturday: because, so far as the forgiveness of sin is concerned, God *could* have absolved man from it without taking our possible human nature.

Had man never fallen, and if, as is maintained in Scotistic theology, Our Lord had deigned to assume the impassible nature of sinless humanity in order to dwell with us in a created form, and live as a creature in the world created for Himself; thereby completing and crowning the work of creation, and binding all creation more closely to its Creator—ruling the universe in equity as king, directing its worship and offering its adoration as priest—this would have been a work of infinite love altogether beyond the comprehension of mere created intelligence: but that God should have taken upon Himself our possible nature, and actually have suffered, and exhausted all manner of suffering, mental and corporal, in it, not only in spite of our sins, but in order to redeem us from our sins, and make us adopted children of God and co-heirs with Him in heaven—this stupendous revelation of God's love it is that makes holy Church exult and cry out with joy, "O truly necessary sin of Adam . . . O happy fault that merited such and so great a Redeemer!"

The Church's joy is like to what Adam's own acts of grateful love must have been after justification from his fall. Inconceivably great was Adam's exultation when, endowed with the gift of original justice and all its accompanying qualities, he poured forth the love of his immaculate soul unto his Creator; yet, surely even greater, or, at least, more intense must Adam's grateful love have been when, overwhelmed by his unexpected pardon, he stood before God justified a second time—justified from his sin through the foreseen merits of the Precious Blood: realizing that to him and his race God had shown efficacious mercy which from the fallen angels had been withheld. Though heartbroken with sorrow for his sin, Adam must have been overwhelmed with joy at the Divine forgiveness. So likewise the Church grieves for the

of this article to the brief statement of the Scotistic view given in two popular books, viz., "Mariae Corona," by Rev. P. A. Sheehan, D.D., pp. 8 sqq.; and "The Blessed Sacrament," Third Edition, by Frederick W. Faber, pp. 50 sqq., and pp. 391 sqq.

sin of Adam; but rejoices that God, who had no part in it, took occasion from it more wondrously to manifest His mercy, and power, and wisdom, and beauty.

These attributes of God are manifested in the Incarnation not only as regards Adam in particular, but also in regard to the sinfulness of Adam's children in general, and, by grand and unique exception, through the sinlessness of most holy Mary.

But for the fall of man we should not have known the wonders of God's power and wisdom in completely hindering sin in the case of His Immaculate Mother; and in the marvellous action of the Divine will undoing sin by the generous pardon of it continually being granted through the merits of Christ.

By reason of her existence in the mind of God from eternity as the Mother of the Incarnate God—through the inseparable relation that eternally bound the Virgin Mother Mary to her Divine Son,—Mary (according to Scotistic theology), in due time, would have naturally come into the world by an Immaculate Conception; but her surpassing beauty as "full of grace" and "blessed amongst women" in contrast with all other children of Adam would not have been so strikingly manifest. It is the fall of man and the universality of original sin that show us Mary as the grand example of a *perfect* Redemption through Christ. Mary stands out a creature in all the ravishing beauty and grandeur of perfect human nature—as poets picture her, "our tainted nature's solitary boast": the "Sweet Benediction in the eternal curse, Veil'd Glory of this lampless universe": "the moon beyond the clouds": "the star above the storm": "the living form among the dead": "the lily among the thorns"—God's masterpiece.

Hence, contemplating this great thing which He that is mighty hath done unto Mary, though deplored the evil of sin, yet our souls magnifying the Lord and our spirits rejoicing in God our Saviour; adapting and using the words of the sacred liturgy, we cry out: "O happy fault of Adam" that occasioned such wondrous revelation to us of God's Omnipotence; which, by a singular grace and privilege, in virtue of the merits of Jesus Christ, in the first instant of her conception, preserved Mary Immaculate—free from all stain of original sin.

So also the sinfulness of Adam's race in general occasions

greater manifestation to us of God's glory; by revealing to us His Divine attributes. In the whole moral and physical order we see God's all-wise design worked out. Though allowing evil—physical and moral—to exist, God brings good out of it. God "judged it better to bring good out of evil than to allow no evil to exist."¹ As when incarnate on earth, God first permitted people to take leprosy, to be tormented with the palsy, and to suffer all manner of ills; and then showed His Divine power and mercy by curing them; as He permitted Lazarus to die, and then raised him to life again "for the glory of God: that the Son of God may be glorified by it" (John xi. 4); so now God *permits* sin and then demonstrates His Almighty power and infinite goodness by remitting it. God works miracles in the order of grace even more frequently than in the order of nature. Those are as easy to God's power as these are; though to us they are far more wonderful and occasions of far greater joy. As St. Augustine says, every time God pardons grievous sin He more wonderfully shows His power than when He created the universe: because there was nothing to resist the Divine Fiat of creation, but the human will can misuse its God-given gift of freedom and temporarily thwart God's uncreated will. For God, by His grace, to dispose the human will fixed in rebellion against His eternal law, and bring it to conform and yield itself up freely to Him, is truly the work of omnipotence. Yet this almighty work of Redemption is going on always—giving occasion for joy both on earth and in heaven. Witnessing it we can exclaim: "O happy fault, that merited such and so great a Redeemer!"; and, "in heaven before the angels of God there is joy upon one sinner that doth penance, more than upon ninety-nine just who need not penance" (Luke xv. 7–10).

Appalled as we are by the vast amount of sin in the world, we are apt to see only the ugly enormity of heaped-up evil, and to overlook the marvellous outpouring of Divine mercy; by which the darkness of human perversity becomes but as the deep shadow outlining more clearly the work of Divine goodness to be seen in the resplendent beauty of souls endowed with sanctifying grace.

In pardoning sinners now, as in forgiving fallen Adam, God works out His all-wise design for His own greater glory

¹ St. Augustine quoted by *The Catholic Gazette*.

through the good of His creatures. We see this exemplified in the lives of so many great penitents. St. Mary Magdalene, St. Augustine, and others are marvels of God's strong goodness in turning evil into good. Had those saints never known the degradation of sin from which God freed them, they had probably never risen to the sublime height of Divine love which eventually was theirs; and the many despairing souls who have gathered hope and courage from their example might have remained unconverted.

In a very striking passage to the Romans (v. 20) St. Paul boldly states the problem of evil.¹ He writes: "The law entered in, that sin might abound. And where sin abounded, grace did more abound." The apostle declares that the malice and weakness of poor human nature is but the warp with which the woof of Divine grace makes its finest fabric. God's grace converts great and inveterate sinners: it also makes inconstant and lukewarm and worldly souls become loyal and fervent and spiritual. Divine grace overcame St. Peter's cowardice in denying his Master; so that he became the dauntless prince of apostles and heroic martyr for Christ. St. Paul, a fierce persecutor of the Church, was made God's Vessel of Election and doctor of the Gentiles. St. Francis of Assisi, a rich merchant's son, and a gay, worldly youth, was changed into the poor, humble, mortified follower of Christ Crucified, who realized his chosen motto, "My God and My All." From the pursuit of mere worldly ambition St. Ignatius of Loyola was led to spend himself in seeking and promoting only the greater glory of God. Such is the beautiful design of Eternal Wisdom governing and directing all created things in His own unsearchable ways, for His own glory and the good of His creatures.

God is Alpha and Omega—infinite in every attribute. "The Lord hath made all things for Himself" (Prov. xvi. 4). "All things were made by Him [the Eternal Word], and without Him was made nothing that was made" (John i. 3). And, as we read in the Canon of the Mass, "by Him and with Him, and in Him [the Eternal Son] is to Thee God the Father, in the unity of the Holy Ghost, all honour and glory." Therefore, everything that ever has been, that is, or that ever shall be—even hell itself—*must* ultimately be to the glory of God. The very sanction of eternal punishment is only because

¹ See "Cords of Adam," by Rev. Thomas J. Gerrard—"Design in the Moral Order."

God's anger is the converse of God's love; and is intended to move men, with the help of Divine grace, to work out their salvation. Eternal punishment is only for those who, with eyes wide open, take it in preference to the eternity of joy God graciously places before them: and even in hell, as St. Thomas Aquinas teaches, no soul suffers so much as it deserves to suffer.¹ God, the Creator, being in and of Himself all-sufficient, and desiring nothing outside Himself but the good of His creatures, is "gracious and true, patient, and ordering all things in mercy" (Wisdom xv. 1-2).

Hence, out of Adam's Fall, God brought good. Original sin did not hinder the fulfilment of God's eternal decree to become incarnate of His Immaculate Virgin Mother Mary; but gave us a more marvellous revelation of Divine mercy by the fresh pathos and new tenderness imparted to the fulfilment of that decree, through the expiatory and remedial character of Christ's coming amongst us.

For this reason holy Church joyously sings: "O happy fault, that merited such and so great a Redeemer!" With grateful hearts we can and should re-echo that joyous cry of the Church; not only with reference to the pardon of original sin, but also as regards all actual sins from which we ourselves or others have been justified. O how admirable is God's goodness towards mankind! How inestimable is His love! He has delivered up His Son to redeem slaves. O truly necessary sin which, having been blotted out by the death of Christ, has revealed to us God's infinite mercy! O happy fault, that merited such and so great a Redeemer!

FR. GEORGE, O.F.M.

¹ See "Cords of Adam," by Rev. Thomas J. Gerrard.

LIVING WITHOUT EATING

I

SINCE I published in this review, ten years ago, some comments on the remarkable abstinence from food recorded in the case of many famous stigmatistas and mystics,¹ at least two fresh examples of the same asitia have been brought to the notice of English readers. The first of these, which meets us in connection with a modern candidate for beatification, Teresa Higginson, is not entirely satisfactory from the point of view of evidence. Still, she stated herself, and her associates undoubtedly believed, that at one period of her life, apart from the reception of the Holy Eucharist, she neither ate nor drank, and that this condition of inedia was prolonged for many years. For fuller particulars and for the answer which has been returned to the objections made by unfriendly critics, the reader must be referred to the "Life of Teresa Higginson," by Lady Cecil Kerr (pp. 181-189).

We have, however, a much better attested instance of the same abstention in the five years' unbroken fast of Therese Neumann, of Konnersreuth (Bavaria), which, so far as I can learn, is still maintained down to this time of writing. Since Christmas 1922 she has, it is stated, eaten nothing solid, and since Christmas 1926 no liquid has been taken by her for the purpose of nourishment. For a time she continued to receive a mouthful of water each day after Holy Communion, but on September 30, 1927, even this was given up. The result is that since the last-mentioned date her strict fast is said to have remained unbroken. With the exception of the Blessed Eucharist itself nothing digestible seems to have passed her lips. We have also to remember that she is not a helpless invalid confined to bed. She attends Mass and other services in the church, she goes about the village on errands of charity—more especially to comfort the sick and dying,—she talks gaily with those who come to consult her, and performs light tasks to help her own family. Moreover, throughout the greater part of the year she renews every Friday her terrible visions of the Passion and loses a by no means inconsiderable quantity of blood from her

¹ See "The Mystic as a Hunger-Striker," in *THE MONTH*, Feb. and March, 1921.

stigmata. What adds to the marvel is the fact that Therese Neumann, in making her daily Communion, does not commonly receive even an entire particle such as is used for the laity. It is only when she is in ecstasy that a whole Host can be given her. So long as she is in conscious possession of her faculties it is not possible for her to swallow more than a tiny fragment rather less than the eighth part of an ordinary Communion wafer.

The astounding nature of this prolonged fast, even apart from the other phenomena, has excited so much attention that the facts called for official enquiry. Accordingly in 1927 a commission was appointed by the Bishop of Regensburg to investigate the case under the direction of a physician of high standing, Dr. Seidl. Four nursing Sisters of Mallersdorf were chosen for the purpose, and a very strict code of regulations was drafted, to the observance of which they were required to bind themselves by oath.¹ Relieving each other by pairs, two of the four were to be continually on duty night and day, never allowing the girl during the prescribed fortnight of observation to be out of their sight even for the shortest interval. Her weight, temperature, pulse, etc., were to be frequently taken. All excreta, whether in the process of natural relief, or by the flow of blood from the stigmata, or by vomiting, etc., were to be preserved, weighed and subsequently submitted for analysis. Her room, clothes, bed, etc., were subjected to a thorough search, and she was always to be under close observation in her intercourse with her parents, family and all other persons. It cannot be questioned that these precautions were strictly necessary if any conclusion was to be reached which would be respected by those—mainly non-Catholics—who declared her to be a vulgar impostor. At the same time, when one reads the chapter in which Dr. Gerlich sets out in the plainest terms² the medical details of the investigation, a certain misgiving presents itself. After all, one asks, what higher purpose does the demonstration of this inedia serve? The Almighty cannot wish us to conclude that pious Christians, encouraged by Therese's example, should strive to live without eating. Abstemiousness carried to this excess would not be a virtue,

¹ See Fritz Gerlich, "Therese Neumann, die Stigmatisierte von Konnersreuth," Vol. I., pp. 129-131.

² See, for example, Vol. I., p. 135. The chronicling of dates and measurements was beyond question quite necessary; but such details jar for all that.

but a vice—a tempting of God. No doubt it impresses the imagination that any holy person should be so far raised above the infirmities of our nature as to draw all vital energy from the Blessed Eucharist alone, but unfortunately when we come to a demonstration of the fact, we find ourselves forced to inquire into a number of physiological data, of which nice-minded people do not ordinarily speak outside a doctor's consulting room. The very reverence we owe to sanctity seems to deprecate our pursuing such researches or subjecting God's chosen servants to such tests.

On the other hand we know that the convulsive contraction of the oesophagus, the rejection from the stomach of swallowed food, the loss of natural appetite (otherwise called anorexia), etc., are not of themselves characteristic of moral virtue; they are rather the well-understood symptoms of certain hysterical disorders. If Therese Neumann, as already mentioned, cannot in her normal consciousness swallow an entire Host, but can do so perfectly well when she is in ecstasy,¹ this surely points to the fact that the neuroses which for several years kept her bed-ridden, contracted, paralysed, blind and deaf, have not yet all been completely eliminated. In the case of several other stigmatistas who are alleged to have lived without food, we know that repeated attempts were made to induce them to take nourishment. In obedience to their spiritual directors or religious superiors many of them forced themselves to swallow the food, liquid or solid, which was set before them, with the result that everything was almost immediately returned, the experiment causing great discomfort and pain to the sufferer. In the lives of St. Catherine of Siena, of Louise Lateau, Anne Catherine Emmerich, Domenica Lazzari, and many others, canonized and uncanonized, we find quite harrowing descriptions of such scenes. But on the other hand we have exactly similar descriptions of the same results in the case of patients, who were not religiously minded but were simply suffering from anorexia and other forms of hysteria. It may be sufficient to appeal to the witnesses who were cited in these pages a few months ago as testifying to the inedia of Mollie Fancher, Mrs. Croad, the Italian children, etc.,²

¹ Dr. Fritz Gerlich (*J.c.* Vol. I., pp. 166-167; and cf. 135 and 168-169) gives a detailed description of her communion with an entire Host in ecstasy. Though a non-Catholic, he was allowed by Pfarrer Naber to stand close in front of her while she received. Therese, of course, was then unconscious of his presence.

² See *THE MONTH*, Dec. 1930, pp. 533, 534; Feb. 1931, pp. 140, 148, 150; March, p. 237.

not to speak of the examples which are quoted in almost every text-book dealing with nervous disorders. Just as I should like to hear of a stigmatica who had no bad family history, and had always herself been a thoroughly healthy subject, free from neuroses of any kind, so in the considerable list of those holy people who are reported to have lived for long periods with no other nourishment but the Blessed Sacrament, one looks, but looks in vain, for the name of one who was free from strange previous inhibitions in the matter of diet and whom the neuropath specialist would have pronounced to be perfectly sound and normal. No competent physician could possibly have said this of Louise Lateau or Teresa Higginson, or Domenica Lazzari, or Anne Catherine Emmerich, or St. Lidwina of Schiedam.

There can be no thought of disputing the fact that the fortnight's observation of Therese Neumann has proved to the satisfaction of all unprejudiced persons that she did not during that period take either food or drink. What is even more striking, the pronounced loss of weight which occurred during the Friday ecstasies was in each case made good during the two or three days which followed. On Wednesday, July 13, 1927, the day before the period of observation began, Therese weighed 55 kilograms (=121 lbs., or 8 stone 9 lbs.); on Saturday, July 16, she weighed 51 kilograms (=112½ lbs.). On Wednesday, July 20, 54 kilograms (=119 lbs.) were recorded, but this again had fallen by the following Saturday to 52½ kilograms (=115 lbs.), though on the Thursday, the final day, it stood once more at 55 kilograms, just as before the experiment. The extreme range of loss and gain was therefore about 8 lbs. It is curious that on two occasions within the fortnight (the 15th and 22nd) there is record of natural relief to the amount of half a litre. There was also on the two Fridays some vomiting, not very considerable in amount, which seems to have been due to the blood from the eyes or forehead running into the mouth. No trace of food was discoverable in the matter thus ejected.

The fortnight's observation of Therese Neumann, which has done much to confirm the belief in her complete abstention from food and drink, brings to mind another similar test carried out in our own country not so many years ago, though this last unfortunately had a much more tragic ending. In a remote part of Carmarthenshire a little girl, des-

cribed by all as an exceptionally pretty child, was said to have lived for more than eighteen months without either eating or drinking. In February, 1867, when the child's extraordinary condition first began to alarm her parents, she was ten years old, emaciated, frail (possibly as the result of a previous attack of scarlet fever), and the victim of strange neurotic seizures. She was the daughter of a small farmer named Evan Jacob, but the family were Welsh and spoke only a little English. Under the medical treatment of Dr. H. H. Davies, who was called in, she grew somewhat better, but she gradually developed a marked aversion for any form of nourishment. Even the sight of other people eating caused her discomfort. When food was pressed upon her, she went into what her mother called "a fit," though such "fits," so far as they came under the observation of others at a later date, consisted of no more than a short period of real or assumed unconsciousness. There was then no pallor or violent contortions. The child simply closed her eyes and seemed to pass into a state of insensibility. But at the beginning the "fits" were more violent and also more protracted. There were also cataleptic symptoms, and a condition of opisthotonus, *i.e.*, the body was arched backwards, so that the head almost touched the feet. The father, who was an ignorant man and apparently possessed of some strange idea that the girl's abstinence was a manifestation of the Divine favour, declared in 1869 that he had taken an oath two years before that he would not offer Sarah any food until she asked for it, since on a particular occasion at that date she fainted when he pressed her to eat.¹ What is certain is that when the parents consented in December, 1869, to allow the child to be watched by nurses, the mother expressly stipulated that the watchers were not to eat in Sarah's presence, because "she would faint if there were food in the room."² In the summer of 1867 Sarah still openly took a little nourishment, but in October it is stated that she would consume no more than a morsel of apple "the size of a pill"

¹ R. Fowler, "A Complete History of the Case of the Welsh Fasting Girl," (1871), p. 70. This book, written by an eminent and experienced medical man, goes into great detail, quoting at length from contemporary reports. Dr. Fowler, whose letter to *The Times*, describing his visit to the girl, brought about the final catastrophe, no doubt presents a perfectly honest statement of all he could learn of the case. Still his book is in some sense a personal apologia, for he was a leading medical witness in the legal proceedings.

² *Ibid.* p. 52, and cf. p. 117. This sounds ridiculous, but a similar hypersensitiveness is recorded of Domenica Lazzari, whose stigmata were unquestionably authentic. See *THE MONTH*, Oct. 1919, p. 292.

which she took in a teaspoon; and shortly after this she began to refuse everything. It is not surprising that even in a remote country district the news of the strange case of a child living without food should circulate among the neighbours. Nothing, however, at a later date aroused so much prejudice against the Jacob family as the belief that this curious malady had been turned in indirect ways into a source of gain. Nevertheless, even Dr. Fowler, whose letters to the press did more than anything else to direct attention to what he regarded as a scandalous imposture, admits that "we have no evidence during the first sixteen months of Sarah's illness either that the girl was made a public show of, or that any money whatever flowed into the pockets of the parents."¹ Apart from short paragraphs in the Welsh papers, the earliest communication to the press in English seems to have been that of an Anglican clergyman, the Rev. Evan Jones, Vicar of Llanfihangel-ar-Arth, who wrote to *The Welshman*, in a letter published February 19, 1869:

Allow me to invite the attention of your readers to a most extraordinary case. Sarah Jacob, a little girl, twelve years of age and daughter of Mr. Evan Jacob, Lletherneuadd, in this parish, has not partaken of a single grain of any kind of food whatever, during the last sixteen months. She did occasionally swallow a few drops of water during the first few months of this period; but now she does not even do that. Still she looks pretty well in the face and continues in possession of her mental faculties. She is in this and several other respects a wonderful little girl.

The Vicar goes on to suggest that in view of the incredulous attitude of many medical men at a distance an investigation of the case ought to take place. Although the response to this letter was not enthusiastic, Mr. Jacob, the girl's father, himself pressed for an inquiry. A committee was formed and a certain number of local people, mostly of the peasant class, agreed to act as watchers. The investigation which followed was, however, of little value. No attempt was made to search the bed and the cupboards, or to exercise any control upon Sarah's intercourse with her parents and her little sister. There were also stories of a notable neglect of duty on the part of some of the watchers. Certain individuals were said to have fallen asleep, or to have had too

¹ Fowler, "Welsh Fasting Girl," p. 11.

much to drink, or to have neglected to put in an appearance at all. Nevertheless they professed to have been satisfied that no food had been taken, and made depositions to that effect. For example:

Watcher, No. 4, James Harris Davies, a medical student, spoke in like manner, and was perfectly positive that nothing had been given to her during the fortnight he had watched there, with the exception of three drops of water, once, to moisten her lips with. He was as great a sceptic as any before he commenced watching, but as he saw nothing to confirm his suspicions, he could conscientiously say that nothing had been given her during his watch.

Watcher, No. 7, Thomas Davies, who had been the greatest sceptic of all, was strongly convinced. He watched Sarah Jacob twelve days, and was quite positive that nothing could have been given her during his watch. He watched her with all possible care, and was very cautious to be in a prominent place, where Sarah Jacob's mouth was always in sight.¹

It has, of course, to be borne in mind that although Sarah was treated as an invalid and seems for two years to have remained continuously in bed, there is no evidence that she was really paralysed and incapable of movement. The investigation in the spring of 1869 must have helped to advertise the alleged marvel of the child who lived without eating. Remote as the farm was, curious visitors came in considerable numbers.² They found a very pretty little girl, reclining on her back, fancifully dressed, crowned with a wreath and decked in all sorts of gay ribbons, who smiled upon them and was very pleased to be admired. She had a little library of pious books which had been given her, and she delighted to show her skill in reading out of them aloud to such as would listen. But it was not only books which were presented to her. Not a few of those who came felt that it would be the proper thing to leave a shilling or half-a-crown behind in acknowledgement of the privilege of admission to this charming spectacle. When they offered money to the father, he demurred, but he said at the same time that a gift might be made to his little daughter; and indeed there seems

¹ Fowler, "Welsh Fasting Girl," p. 23.

² At the nearest railway station boys used to hang about carrying cards inscribed "Fasting Girl," etc., and they offered to act as guides to the house. *Ibid.* 29.

often to have been a receptacle lying on her breast into which silver could be put.

This could not go on long without its attracting some attention in scientific circles. The above-mentioned Dr. Robert Fowler, Vice-President of the Hunterian Society, who had friends in South Wales, paid a visit to Sarah Jacob on August 30, 1869, accompanied by his host, a solicitor who was resident not far off. Both gentlemen were convinced that the plump and smiling little person who glanced about her so slyly out of the corners of her eyes could not for two years past have been living upon air. Dr. Fowler accordingly addressed a strong protest to *The Times* giving a detailed account of his visit,¹ and the effect of this letter eventually was that a new committee was appointed to arrange for a really scientific investigation of the alleged phenomenon. It is important to note that the parents, from the first, seem to have raised no sort of difficulty. Considering the extremely limited accommodation of their wretched one-storied dwelling—Dr. Fowler's book provides a photograph and a plan—it would have been easy for them to plead that a fortnight's observation by nurses who were to remain with the girl continually would be impossible. Moreover, it was December, and the place was horribly cold and damp. Four nurses, one of them a Welsh girl speaking Welsh, were procured from Guy's Hospital. A code of instructions was issued to them in which the point more specially insisted upon was that "they were there to see whether food was given to the girl. They were not themselves to offer her food, but to give food if she asked for it." This was also repeated to them orally in the presence of the father. On this occasion the whole room, with its cupboards, etc., was thoroughly turned out, the bed examined and re-made by the nurses, and the child herself was stripped and re-clothed in her night-dress. The four nurses, relieving each other in pairs after eight hours on duty, were supposed to be acting in concert with, and in subordination to, a committee of doctors, one of whom was to visit the house daily. Unfortunately this part of the arrangements had not been fully thought out. One or two doctors were named without their consent having previously been obtained, and the reader gets the impression that these medical visits were very haphazard and were carried out without any individual amongst them assuming full direction and responsibility.

¹ It was printed in *The Times* for Sept. 7, 1869.

For the first few days all went well. The child herself was in high spirits; she seemed physically well-nourished and was free from bed-sores. Throughout the inquiry there is no suggestion of any effort having been made by the parents to evade the control or to try to lure the nurses away from the post of duty; neither was little Sarah ever seen to attempt to get out of bed. Asked if she was in pain, she invariably said No. On more than one occasion nature was relieved, and the child had to be moved while the bedding was changed. After three or four days, however, conditions changed considerably for the worse. The period of observation had begun on Thursday, December 9, 1869. At 2 p.m. on the following Tuesday she had a pulse of 144, but Dr. Hughes, who then visited her, said that "being a hysterical child, he did not think so badly of it." On the next day, Wednesday, as the nurses recorded, she had slept little, her eyes were sunken and the nose pinched; she was restless and unable to read. Still, Dr. Lewis who visited her made the following entry in the nurses' diary: "Dec. 15, Wednesday. Dr. Lewis visited and found Sarah Jacob as usual, pulse 120. Skin warm on right hand. She is not so flushed as on the first day of watching. She says she has no pain and is placid."¹ On Thursday at 11 a.m. the Vicar called. The child's condition alarmed him and he proposed that the test should end and the nurses be dismissed; Dr. Davies, however, the local medical man, who had attended her originally and seen her at intervals for the last two years, was of opinion that there was no danger.² On that Thursday afternoon both parents were told that *in the opinion of the nurses* the child was "threatening to sink," but the father averred that he had "seen her as bad or worse than that before," and he was opposed to the suggestion that the watch should be given up.³ The child herself at no moment during these eight days expressed any desire for food or drink. At 10 o'clock on the Thursday evening she became very restless and the nurses

¹ Fowler, "Welsh Fasting Girl," p. 64.

² The tone of the medical men when examined in court hardly seems to me to accord with what their own hands had written in the nurses' diary. On the Thursday at 4.10 p.m., less than 24 hours before the child's death, Dr. Lewis with Mr. Hughes (surgeon), both of whom had been summoned by telegraph, came to the house, and, before leaving, the former in the name of them both made this entry: "The state of Sarah has improved since the early afternoon . . . eyes natural, etc.; she has conversed pleasantly with me and has smiled . . . there is no clamminess of the skin, no signs of sinking, no delirium, no wandering of her mind." Fowler, p. 73.

³ The father declared that the Doctors Lewis and Davies "told me that the child was not in danger," and he swore that "neither the doctors nor the nurses ever told me that the child was dying for want of food." *Ibid.* p. 72.

thought she was sinking. The next morning, Friday, she seemed to lose the power of speech, and about 3 p.m. she died.

All through the country the watch maintained in the room of the "Welsh Fasting Girl" had been a conspicuous item in the news placards, and when the pitiful climax was reached there was a violent outburst of feeling. Every leader-writer and every man in the street was certain that somebody was guilty of murder and ought to be criminally prosecuted, but no two persons could agree in deciding with whom the guilt precisely rested. Some said it was the doctors, some said it was the parents, some said it was the nurses or the Governors of Guy's Hospital, some said it was those who had insisted on such an investigation being carried out, some said it was the police or the officials of the Home Office who had not intervened in time to prevent the catastrophe. A post-mortem was made of the poor child's body, and three medical men of high standing found proof, as they believed, that previously to the coming of the nurses little Sarah Jacob must have been taking nourishment by stealth or otherwise. There was no emaciation; on the contrary they reported that "a considerable layer of subcutaneous fat was cut through" in making the section from the throat to the abdomen. There were faeces in the bowel, and the stomach was not notably contracted. On the other hand the principal organs—lungs, heart, kidneys, etc.—were quite healthy, and the autopsy proved that there was nothing which could cause physical obstruction to the passage of food and its waste products. Already the *Daily News*, on Thursday, December 16th, had protested against features that were "almost grotesque in the proceedings which are taking place at the bedside of a little girl in Wales":

The latest report is that at the close of the fifth day of the watching, the girl had actually fasted, and was very weak and ill. This would seem to be so natural a result of five days' fasting that the wonder seems to be that the nurses do not at once persuade her to take some nourishment. Suppose the poor girl has hitherto been fed unconsciously to herself and is too weak to desire food, or too languid to express a wish for it, the result of this watching may simply be that she will be starved to death. Martyr of science, or victim of superstition, which will this poor girl be if she should die under the eyes of these

nurses, and die of starvation? Probably the persons concerned have already ascertained what their legal position would be in such a case.

On the very morning of Sarah's death *The Lancet* was "able to declare, on good authority, that no confidence can be placed in the statements made regarding the Welsh fasting girl, since the doctors and nurses are bound to divulge nothing until the inquiry has terminated." But the medical journal adds: "Of course every precaution has been taken in the event of the girl showing symptoms of exhaustion, and the nurses have special instructions to administer stimulants and food, subject to the advice of the daily medical attendant." All the same a fatal termination was reached on that same Friday afternoon, and the jury, at the inquest which followed, brought in a verdict that Sarah Jacob had "died from starvation caused from negligence on the part of the father to induce the child to take food."

The feeling throughout the country was such that the legal advisers of the Crown felt bound to take action. Accordingly five of the medical men who had been connected with the case, as well as Mr. Evan Jacob and his wife, were all charged with manslaughter before the magistrates of Carmarthenshire, the indictment stating that "you did feloniously kill and slay one Sarah Jacob, of Lletherneuadd aforesaid, against the peace of our Lady the Queen, her Crown and dignity, and contrary to the statute in that case made and provided." The proceedings excited immense interest in the Principality, and the Court in which the magistrates met was crowded to suffocation. After a patient hearing and much legal argument, the doctors were discharged, but Jacob and his wife were committed for trial.

At Carmarthen, on July 15, 1870, the trial came on before Mr. Justice Hannen (afterwards Lord Hannen); while Mr. H. C. Giffard, Q.C., who later on was better known as Lord Chancellor Halsbury, conducted the prosecution for the Crown. Without making any reflection upon the perfect good faith of either the prosecuting counsel or the presiding judge, I think it may be said that justice was meted out to Jacob and his wife in rather harsh measure. After a merciless summing up by the judge, strongly adverse to the prisoners, the jury returned a verdict of guilty. The husband was accordingly sentenced to twelve months' hard labour and the wife to six. Evan Jacob was already a ruined man. The

costs of the defence had swallowed up every penny he possessed.

The case presents many features which are extremely puzzling. What is most certain of all is that the father and mother, even if they had been utterly inhuman parents—and every scrap of evidence suggests on the contrary that they were devoted to their daughter and humoured all her whims—had the strongest reasons for wishing to preserve the life of the child, if only as a source of income. I cannot doubt that they had really persuaded themselves that she somehow lived without food. Unfortunately in a short article it is impossible to give details, but the oath which, as they declared, they both had taken never again to press her to eat, must have been founded upon the experience they had had at the beginning of her illness two years before, when, as the mother said, the very sight of food brought on an attack, which at that date was of a very alarming nature. On the day of her death, Dr. Davies, the only medical man who had been a witness to those early seizures, decided *not* to attempt to give her nourishment, though he had the father's permission to do so. He thought, apparently, that she was now too weak, and that the shock of trying to force food upon her would extinguish prematurely the frail spark of life which remained. What is more, it seems to me most probable that Sarah herself in her normal personality was convinced she took no food. She did not show the slightest reluctance to submit to the new and more rigid inquiry. No one of the nurses was conscious of any trace of resentment in the child's manner. She was not detected in any trick. I am therefore inclined to suggest that she was able to live with extraordinarily little nourishment, and that when she swallowed food, another (undetected) personality had supervened,—the four intermittent personalities of Mollie Fancher will perhaps be fresh in the reader's memory—of whose procedure the normal self had no knowledge. Just as Therese Neumann in ecstasy can swallow the Host which it would be impossible to give her in her normal state, so poor Sarah Jacob, in another personality, may have been able to take food without difficulty. The unwonted conditions created by the constant presence of two nurses, or by the absence of the little sister who usually slept with her, may sufficiently account for the fact that during the period of observation the secondary personality did not emerge.

HERBERT THURSTON.

TOURISTS IN RUSSIA

AN expert has been defined as an ordinary person away from home. An Englishman in Russia is an expert on England, and though it may not follow strictly from the definition, it seems to be commonly assumed that an Englishman who has been to Russia, for however short a period, is an expert on that country. Mr. Bernard Shaw and the Marquess of Lothian have recently returned from Russia where they spent nine whole days. Such a period is, of course, ample for the collection of material for many lectures and journalistic articles. The Liberal and the I.L.P. Summer Schools had the pleasure of listening, one to Lord Lothian and the other to Mr. Shaw, almost as soon as these celebrities were back in England, and as it happened to be Bank Holiday week, when news is rather scarce, the newspapers had plenty of space to report them. Two years ago, the present writer became an expert on Russia. I was in the land of the Soviets three times as long as Mr. Shaw, and though I was not granted an interview by Stalin, my personal insignificance left me undisturbed to make the fullest use of the time at my disposal, and I was not limited to the conventional calls at Moscow and Leningrad, but got as far as Kharkov, the capital of the Ukraine. I did not know the language any more than Mr. Shaw, and my knowledge of the country remains infinitesimal. Nevertheless, I anticipated Mr. Shaw by lecturing to a Summer School, which the Catholic Social Guild was holding in Oxford, shortly after my return. I have repeated that lecture until I am tired of it. I dare not disclose how many hundreds of thousands of words I have written about my month in Russia.

An advertising slogan for a certain brand of cigarette is "They Never Vary," and it is a claim that could be made for the itineraries of tourists in Moscow. Among hotels, one stays at the Metropole, the Savoy, or the Grand; one visits the Kremlin, the Opera, the Art Theatre, a new factory, a new workers' house, a workers' rest and culture park, a workers' club, a proletarian law court and a registry office for births, deaths, marriages and divorces. The new factories in Moscow are slavish copies of new factories everywhere else. The new workers' houses are no more original than London County Council tenements. All the workers' rest and culture parks in Moscow are not a patch on Battersea Park, and the workers' clubs would not be envied by the members of the

British Legion. Some visitors to Moscow are fascinated by the possessive prefix Workers', before clubs, libraries, schools and other useful institutions. Such institutions are as open to the workers in England as they are under the Soviet, and in England they are so numerous that we do not notice them, while in Russia they are novelties and rarities.

As all the tourists see the same sights, they see the same people and hear the same views. There are the members of the diplomatic corps, especially the British representatives, to be met; there are the correspondents of English and American newspapers; there are teachers of English in Moscow University, and a few other English-speaking people who are in Moscow for business reasons. Then there are English-speaking Russians at Vox, the Society for Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries, which places its facilities at the disposal of visitors and shows them what it is good for them to see. Mr. Shaw says it is all rubbish to say he only saw what he was shown. The things he wanted to see were precisely the things he did see. He did not want to see poverty and the other remains of the capitalist system they had not been able to remove. He could see them within twenty minutes of his home in London. Yet Mr. Shaw could also have seen new factories in London if he had wanted to. Moscow has made absolutely no innovation of any industrial value. The only novelty that Mr. Shaw witnessed was the anti-religious museum and, as he said himself, "It is all an attack on priesthood such as would have made the people from Belfast jump for joy." There is no originality in attacks on priesthood. When Mr. Shaw was asked about the treatment of religion in Russia, he said nobody was prevented from going to church, but the people did not go because they were too busy working. This does not say much for the seven-hour day and five-day week which are supposed to be enjoyed by the Russian workers. Mr. Shaw followed the usual tactic of avoiding the real question about persecution in Russia. It is not that people are prevented from going to church, but that crushing penalties are imposed on those who keep churches open, and religious teaching is forbidden while the teaching of atheism is compulsory on all the children in all the schools. Some time ago Mr. Malcolm MacDonald, M.P., son of the Prime Minister, rose in the House of Commons to tell how he had been in Moscow and had been present at a religious service attended by 3,000 people in the Church of the Redeemer. Mr. Malcolm MacDonald quoted this to show there was religious

freedom in Russia. It is only two years since he was in Moscow, but when he goes again he will find that great Church of the Redeemer, the largest in Moscow, has been demolished like scores of others.

Mr. Shaw makes Communism to be a religion, and in a sense this is true. Almost every writer on Soviet Russia has expressed the same idea, and it is surprising that Mr. Shaw should think he astonished the Russians by telling them that the Communist Party is a Church. According to Mr. Shaw the essence of religion is for men to work for purposes outside themselves and to sacrifice themselves. What is the purpose of Bolshevism? This is the fundamental question that Mr. Shaw does not ask. He tells us that the Communists sacrifice themselves for it. They have sacrificed all liberty and they sacrifice human life as if it were dirt. There is no capital punishment in Russia, says Mr. Shaw. "You can commit a murder on very reasonable terms." Yet there is capital punishment for political offenders. "On this point they are frightfully ruthless," says Mr. Shaw. "It is startling to take such people out and shoot them, but nevertheless, it has to be done." Whether there was laughter among the I.L.P. audience at this Shavian wit I do not know. Lord Lothian told the Liberal Summer School of the extermination of bourgeoisie and kulaks by the million. There had been nothing like it in history. It beggared description. "They reply to criticism by saying that Europe lost thirty million killed and wounded during the war and if it cost as much to build the Russian new heaven and earth, well it would cost it!"

We have not yet the answer to the question of what is the Communist heaven. It is simply the production of material wealth. The Bolsheviks are utterly crazy, maniacal about mechanization and increased output. They sacrifice everything that makes life worth living in order to industrialize everybody and everything. Machines are the Idols to which they bow down and adore and offer living victims. I am not speaking of the ordinary Russians, but of the fanatical minority who are running Russia. It is my opinion that the ordinary people are much less affected by the whole thing than the foreign friends or enemies of Bolshevism believe.

It is true that, by means of propaganda, much of the idealism in Russian human nature has been concentrated on the Five Year Plan. The fulfilment of the Five Year Plan is the one thing to live for. Any Communist, if one may say so without irreverence, who loves father or mother, or hus-

band or wife, or sister or brother better than the Five Year Plan is not worthy of Communism. I may tell a story of Petrovna, a teacher and a zealous member of the Communist League of Youth. Petrovna married an engineer named Tereschenko. Their work forced them to live apart, the husband in Leningrad and the wife in distant Bezhetsk. The husband was lonely and wrote for his wife to join him. She was lonely too, and wanted her husband, but she replied she could not leave her work. Again and again her husband pleaded, but always she refused him, though with tears. At last the husband became peremptory. "Come to me in spite of everything. Let them exclude you from the Labour Exchange. Choose between me and the Five Year Plan." And Petrovna chose to love, honour and obey her husband more than the Five Year Plan. She has been expelled from the Communist League of Youth and from her trade union. Her conduct has been officially declared shameful and it is a question whether her teacher's diploma should be taken from her. Yet I fancy that there are few Russian women who would not do as Petrovna did in similar circumstances.

Regarding marriage in Russia, Mr. Shaw said divorce was quite easy and "one of the results of being able to do it in a moment is that they do not do it." He said there is as strong a feeling as here in family relations. The fact that a husband could get rid of his wife or a wife of her husband made them behave much better than here. The system made for the stability of the family. Whenever Mr. Shaw speaks, I always regard him, in his own words, as "a paradox-monger, not to say a liar." But I was surprised to see Lord Lothian giving similar testimony. He said irregular relations between the sexes are discountenanced, and if men and women are found living in an irregular union, the Soviet required them to get married but, being married, either party could obtain divorce at any time.

When I was in Moscow I went to the registry office and the registrar told me that at that office they averaged 25 marriages a day and 10 divorces. With divorces equal to forty per cent of the marriages, the assertion of Mr. Shaw that the freedom of divorce results in there not being divorce can be measured at its true worth. Also, when I was in Moscow I made quite sure that the Soviet made no effort to press cohabiting couples to get married. If they are doing so now their policy has changed since 1929. I was struck by the shamelessness—a word to which they would not object—of the Soviet spokes-

men about the repudiation of what are still the conventional ideas of morality in this country. I am inclined to think that since 1929 they have learned that the Soviet marriage code is not a good advertisement for them in other countries and, to use the vulgar metaphor, they are spinning a new yarn now. I found that Communist principles and the Soviet law concerning marriage and the family were almost as bad as bad could be. Yet I was told repeatedly that there is a great deal of good family life in Russia despite the laws, and I believe this to be true. Probably the majority of Russian husbands and wives live together in love and fidelity. Russia was a Christian nation at least until 1917, and the effects of centuries of Christianity are not destroyed by an atheist tyranny in a few years.

As one who follows fairly closely the news from Russia, I think that visitors who do not know the language seldom learn anything fresh. We do not learn from tourists or from newspaper correspondents how religion is faring among the Russian people. Yet religion is not only the most important thing in itself, but the political and economic outcome must depend on the fate of religion. We can learn most about the state of religion by translations of extracts from the Russian press, and these are not unhopeful.

The interest taken in Russia by Britain and the United States is a somewhat puzzling phenomenon. There seems to be no limit to the demand for books, articles and lectures on Russia. This interest is not shared by countries closer to Russia. A very intelligent and well-informed Pole said to me : "Why do you get so excited about the Five Year Plan ? We in Poland hardly think of it and our frontiers march with Russia. Even if the Plan is a hundred per cent successful it will only mean that Russia has reached an economic position corresponding to her growth in population since 1913." The perturbation about Russia in England and America is probably due to uneasiness about the stability of the capitalistic system and the fear that if Russia demonstrates Communism to be in the smallest degree successful the proletarian masses of England and America will be tempted to "follow Russia." It is certainly significant that the two countries reputed to be the richest and strongest in the world should be more nervous about the "Red Menace" than a poor country like Poland. Britain may, or may not, be in danger of "going Red," but Poland certainly is not. This gives us something to think about.

H. SOMERVILLE.

FATHER PERSONS, S.J., AND THE SEMINARIES IN SPAIN

VI

IN a series of articles, that recently appeared in this periodical, concerning the foundation work of Father Persons in Spain, it was shown that he was led to establish the seminaries and residences there partly because of the financial embarrassment of Douay which had defied every attempt to remedy it during the preceding years, and partly because of its precarious existence caused by the civil war in France. In this work, indeed, the needs of the Faith in England were carefully considered: the Spanish seminaries with the two residences enabled many, for whom in the existing circumstances no room could have been found at Douay or Rome, to pursue their clerical studies, and so helped to keep up the supply of priests for the English mission: the college of St. Omer's provided an education for the sons of English Catholics which was sorely needed, and the financial difficulties of Douay were in part relieved by some of its students being sent to the Spanish seminaries and by Persons obtaining in February, 1594, the payment of the arrears of the Spanish pension due to it.¹

The Appellant priests did not appreciate this work, and in some of their writings endorsed the Government view of the seminaries,²—not a surprising fact, it was pointed out, considering that many of these books showed the influence of their alliance with the Government, and that in some of them what Catholics and Popes had hitherto done for the upholding of the Faith in England was repudiated, and even the persecution of the Government defended.

An anonymous writer in the *Clergy Review*³ has, however, by directly challenging these conclusions, based though they were on a close study of the contemporary sources to which full references were given, afforded me a useful opportunity of establishing by fuller evidence the entire integrity of Persons's actions and motives and of further exposing the groundlessness of the hostility he met with at the hands of certain

¹ Cf. *THE MONTH*, 1931, March, May, June, July and August.

² *THE MONTH*, 1931, March, pp. 194, 195, where references to the contemporary records are given.

³ July, 1931, pp. 87, 88.

Catholics. The method of my critic, let it be said frankly, is one of insinuation, not of proof. He adduces no evidence from the documents of the period, and indeed shows little or no acquaintance with such, nor even with the modern authorities such as Law, Usher, Meyer, and the late Father Pollen. He questions, for instance, the above statement that in some of the works of the Appellant priests "practically all that successive Popes and leading Catholics had hitherto done for the Faith was repudiated and the policy—even the persecution of the Government—defended."¹ Had he but read two of the Appellants' works,—"Important Considerations" and "A Decacordon of Ten Quodlibetical Questions"—he would have realized that the statement was justified.² The "paradoxa," taken from the Appellants' book and submitted to the Inquisition by the procurators of the Archpriest in 1602 contained propositions in this sense;³ and on July 20, 1602, these Appellant books were prohibited and condemned by the Holy Office.⁴ The English Government, indeed, as Protestant writers have done since the time of Elizabeth, appealed to these Appellants' books as justifying from the priests' own writings its proceedings with Catholics from the beginning of the reign.⁵ This is only a small part of the evidence: but let it suffice.

Again, the anonymous writer calls in question the alliance of the Appellants with the persecuting Government. Yet no modern authority denies it, for the simple reason that the contemporary documents, which came to light with the opening of archives for centuries inaccessible to students, contain abundant evidence of it; far too much, indeed, to be dealt with adequately in the space at my disposal.⁶ From his own testimony, for instance, Watson, one of the Appellants, undertook *at the invitation of the Government*, to write a book

¹ THE MONTH, March, 1931, p. 194.

² The full title of the former work is "Important Considerations which ought to move all true and sound Catholics who are not wholly Jesuited, to acknowledge without all equivocation, ambiguities or shiftings, that the proceedings of her Majesty and the State with them, since the beginning of her Highnesse reign, have been both mild and merciful." 1601.

³ The paradoxa are printed from the Petty MSS. Inner Temple, in Law, "Archpriest Controversy," I., p. 145; cf. Paradoxum 3m, Propositiones 7a, 8a; Paradoxum 4m, Propositio 5a.

⁴ "Archiv. West.", vii., No. 52, f. 263.

⁵ "The True Reasons of her Majesty's late proceedings with Recusants," etc. "Archiv. West.", vii., f. 439.

⁶ Cf. Law, "Jesuits and Seculars," Introduction: "Archpriest Controversy," Introduction: Usher, "The Reconstruction of the English Church" (1910), I., c. viii. Meyer, "England and the Catholic Church under Queen Elizabeth," pp. 435 ff. Pollen, "The Institution of the Archpriest Blackwell."

against "Doleman's Conferences on the Succession." He was captured while engaged on the work, and wrote complainingly that the Government had not kept faith with him.¹ Later, he escaped: but peace was again made between him and the Government through the negotiations of Bluet, one of the leaders of the Appellants, with Bancroft, the Protestant Bishop of London.² What the price of peace was, may be guessed both from the subsequent activities of Watson and from a letter of Bancroft a little more than a month after its proposal. Writing to Sir Robert Cecil on August 18, 1601, he states: "At the receipt of your letter Watson was with me. I find him very tractable and eager to whet his pen against the Jesuits, . . ."³

Added to this was the strange spectacle of the English Government allowing and helping several of the Appellant priests—some of them prisoners—to leave the country under the guise of banishment, in order to prosecute an appeal to the Pope, the recognition of whose authority was a penal offence. This plan, indeed, was suggested by Bagshaw, the chief of the Appellants, to Bluet, and was brought about by the latter's negotiations with Bancroft. Bluet himself announced the fact in the already cited letter to Mush, July 1, 1601, and asked him to keep it secret. Mush, though earlier he had condemned these dealings with the Government, had no scruple this time of availing himself of its help.⁴ Nor did

¹ Watson to the Attorney General, April, 1599. Printed from the Petyt MSS., in Law, "Archpriest Controversy," I, 210 ff. Note the conditions on which he undertook the work. *Ibid.*

² Bluet in a letter to Mush, another of the Appellants, July 1, 1601, writes: "I have made Mr. Watson's peace, if he will himself." Persons's "Apologie," 210. Cf. Tierney-Dodd, III., cxli. For Bluet's negotiations with Bancroft at this time cf. *infra*.

³ Bancroft to Sir R. Cecil, August 18, 1601. "Hatfield Calendar," xi., p. 350. Cf. also, "Privy Council to Bancroft," October 25, 1601. Dasent, "Acts of Privy Council," vol. 32, 1601-1604, p. 308, and Introduction, XXX.

⁴ Bagshaw to Bluet, April 27, 1601. Petyt MSS. printed in Law, "Jesuits and Seculars," p. 150. Bluet to Mush, July 1, 1601, *ut supra*. Bluet's explanation given at Rome, Law, *Ibid.* Appendix: translation in "Dom. Cal. Eliz.," 1601-1603, p. 167, No. 70. Bancroft to Sir R. Cecil, July 1, August 3, "Hatfield Calendar," xi., pp. 311, 318, cf. also Bluet to Bancroft, Sept. 13 [1601]. *Ibid.* xi., p. 389. Bryde to Cecil, Aug. 27, 1601. *Ibid.* xi., p. 363. Passports for John Mush and Francis Barnaby (another Appellant), Sept. 1, 1601. Dasent, "Acts of Privy Council," vol. 32, p. 205. Privy Council to Commissioners at Framlingham, Oct. 11, 1601. *Ibid.* p. 254. Order of "banishment" for Bagshaw, Bluet, Berkley (Barnaby) and Finch (Bennett), Oct. 21, 1601. *Ibid.* p. 299, cf. also, "Warrant to all her Majesty's Officers," Oct. 26, 1601. *Ibid.* p. 316. Winwood to Cecil, Dec. 21, 1601, Jan. 6, 1601-2, "Winwood Memorials," I, pp. 368, 373. Privy Council to Bancroft, Feb., 1602, "Dom. Cal. Eliz.," 1601-3, p. 155, No. 40. "Mush to Blackwell, March 2 [1601], printed in Law, "Archpriest Controversy," I, p. 158. "The True Reasons of her Majesty's late proceedings with Recusants," *ut supra*. That the banishment was only a pretence is clear from the documents, etc. Cf. also Meyer, *op. cit.*, 435 ff, and the secondary authorities already cited.

the alliance stop there. Books were allowed by the Government to be sent from England to the Appellants to assist them in forwarding the appeal.¹ During its prosecution the Appellants informed Bancroft of all that happened in Rome and elsewhere connected with it; Bluet indeed suggesting to him that their letters should be sent by Winwood, the English agent of the Government in Paris; and Watson, staying at Bancroft's house under his charge, being apparently the intermediary in England.² Cecil and Bancroft were anxious to keep their dealing with these priests as secret as possible, for they were afraid of the Puritans causing trouble on account of it; but it leaked out and Bancroft was charged by one of the latter with having incurred a *præmunire* for helping the Appellants to prosecute their appeal to the Pope.³ At Rome, itself, the Appellants were accused of dealing with the English Government. Such action was condemned by the Holy Office on July 20, 1602, and in the Pope's Brief of October 5, 1602, was prohibited, no matter what the pretext, under pain of excommunication.⁴ Their dealings with Parry, the English Ambassador at Paris, and through him with Cecil and Bancroft—even after the Pope's prohibition under pain of excommunication,—may be seen in the French correspond-

¹ Bancroft to Cecil, May 18, 1602, "Hatfield Calendar," xii., p. 158.

² Cf. Bluet to Bancroft, Sept. 13, 1601. Barnaby to Sir R. Cecil, Dec. 15, 1601, "Hatfield Calendar," xi., pp. 289, 520. Bagshaw to Watson, Feb. 27, 1602, Petyt MSS., printed in Law, "Archpriest Controversy," II., 182. Bancroft to Cecil, May 9, 1602. Bluet to Bancroft, May 14, 1602, June 3, 1602. Warning him of a possible Spanish attack on Hull, and "to take heed of one Hollie a Jesuit; not far from Hull." Bancroft to Cecil, June 26, 1602, Sept. 26, 1602, "Hatfield Calendar," xii., pp. 148, 154, 204 ff., 399. Bagshaw to Bancroft, Sept. 27, 1602, Petyt MSS., printed in Law, *op. cit.*, II., 204-5. Bishop (another Appellant), to Bancroft, Paris, Oct. 27, 1602, *re* strengthening their party *v.* the Jesuits. Note the endorsement of the letter "To my singular friend Mr. Watson at my L of Londons," i.e., Bancroft's. Bluet to Bancroft, Dec., 1602, Petyt MSS., printed in Law, *op. cit.*, II., 219, 194, 230. Cf. also Bancroft to Cecil, Dec. 16, 1602, "Hatfield Calendar," xii., p. 519. Same to same, "Dom. Cal. Eliz.," 1601-1603, p. 155, No. 40. Cf. also Bagshaw to Sir R. Cecil, April 29, [1601?]. *Ibid.* p. 30, No. 65.

³ Cf. Letter of April 17-27, 1602, "Dom. Cal. Eliz.," 1601-1603, p. 185, No. 4. Cecil to Parry, Nov. 4, 1604, Record Office, French Correspondence. Bluet to Bancroft, Dec. 6, 1602, *u.s. supra*. Cecil to Parry, Dec. 14, 1602, Record Office, French correspondence. Cecil to Parry, Feb., 1602-3, *ibid.* Basset (Blount) to Marco (Persons), April 7, 1602, "West. Archiv.," vii., 86, p. 213.

⁴ Cf. the 2m Scriptum handed in by the procurators of the Archpriest, viz., R. Halle to Cardinal Protector and to the Nuncio in Belgium, Jan. 4, Feb. 8, 1602. Worthington to Cardinal Borghese, Dec. 18, 1601. Singleton [an assistant of the Archpriest], to Cardinal Protector, Oct. 12, 1601. Archpriest to Cardinal Protector, Oct. 1, 1601. Copy at Farm Street. Cf. also "Archiv. West.," vii., No. 52 f., 263. "Considerationes quaedam . . .", Oscott Archives, 534, pp. 219-225. "English in Rome to the Inquisition," "Archiv. West.," vii., 70. Pope's brief, "Venerunt nuper," in Tierney-Dodd, III., clxxxi.

ence at the Record Office.¹ That such an alliance of priests with the persecutors of the Faith—who during this period put to death some of our martyrs—was harmful to Catholicism is obvious: it led directly to the oath of allegiance, of which the form drawn up by the Appellants and submitted to the Government was the forerunner.² Other consequences of the Appellant books and of their dealings with the Government—discreditable consequences of treachery to their brethren,—even after the Pope's Brief, may be seen in the already cited French correspondence in the Record Office.³

Let this suffice, though not all the available evidence has been cited. That some of the Appellant books repudiated practically all that successive Popes and leading Catholics had hitherto done for the Faith in England, and defended the policy and even the persecution of the Government, and that the Appellants themselves were in alliance with the Government, are facts beyond dispute; and it is, to say the least, surprising that one who lays claim, as does the critic, to knowledge of the Appellants' case, should question them. When, however, the critic writes, "Persons, as is well known, was an intrepid defender of the Faith: the Appellant Priests were apparently hostile to it. Evidently they had to fight Persons," and ascribes such views to me, I must simply protest. Their alliance with the Government was a serious fault and is, indeed, to be condemned: but that they wavered in their Faith and opposed Persons in consequence of it,—such opinions will not be found in my articles. It is quite unworthy of the writer to suggest to his readers, who may not have read the articles, that such were the views expressed in them.

¹ It chiefly concerns Bagshaw. Bluet and John Cecil. Cf. the correspondence between Parry and Sir R. Cecil, 1602, 1603, Record Office, French correspondence. Cf. also *Ibid.*, Bagshaw to Cecil, Feb. 18-28, 1602-3, and Bluet to Bancroft, July 27, 1603. "Archiv. West." vii., 94, f. 465.

² Cf. Cecil to Watson, Jan. or Feb., 1602 [1603?], in "Archpriest Controversy," II. Cf. the "Paradoxa" submitted to the Inquisition. *Ibid.* II., 151. Cf. "Arch. West," vii., 17, f. 125. "The Catholic Laity of England to the Pope," Feb. 2, 1602. "Oscott Archives," 534, pp. 239-46. 2m Scriptum of the Procurators of the Archpriest 7a Ratio. The Pope ordered Persons to write secretly to England condemning the oath (1602); this, before the submission of the form by the Appellants to the Government. Form of Allegiance submitted by the Appellants, Feb. 1603. "Archpriest Controversy," II., 246. Tierney-Dodd III, clxxviii. Cf. also Bancroft to Cecil, Feb. 1, 1602-3. "Hatfield Calendar," xii., and "Declaration by the Secular Priests," "Dom. Cal. Eliz." 1601-3, p. 283, Nos. 14, 15.

³ Parry to Cecil correspondence, *ut supra*. Cf. Petty. MSS. Inner Temple 538, 47, ff. 386, 387, 388.

In the second part of his review the anonymous writer asserts that Persons was not disinterested in his work in Spain, and gives the reader a choice of two motives. Again, it is all by way of insinuation. There is not an atom of proof. "It sometimes happens," he writes, "that services are rendered at a price. The Scots College at Douay was also assisted by Father Persons and other Jesuits in a very generous way; but note the sequel: 'for this reason, the Jesuits afterwards claimed the property as their own, although it was admitted that in its early years secular clergy had been educated there.' (Cath. Encyc. on Douai.)" A strange argument indeed! Persons and other Jesuits helped the Scots College at Douay. Two centuries later—the writer omits this fact—the Jesuits on the strength of this claimed the property. Therefore Persons and other Jesuits in assisting the Scots College did so in order that the Society of Jesus might in future years lay claim to the property! Hence, too, Persons's motive—for that is the point in question—in obtaining money for the *English* College, Douay, and in founding the Spanish seminaries, was that the Jesuits later might claim these colleges as their own. Invoking an event in the eighteenth century, to ascribe an unworthy motive to a good work performed in the sixteenth; two whole centuries earlier! This is reading history backwards with a vengeance, and hardly to be expected of a writer in these later, more scientific days.

But further, to ascribe such a motive to Persons is to overlook the fact that in the years 1589—1594, during which the Spanish Colleges were founded and the payment obtained of the arrears of pension due to Douay, both Persons and Allen did not contemplate centuries of exile for the seminaries, but were looking forward hopefully to the restoration of the Faith on the death of Elizabeth, and, with the restoration of the Faith, be it remarked, the re-establishment of a hierarchy of English bishops who certainly would not have allowed a claim on the part of the Jesuits to the property of the seminaries. Even as late as 1596, Persons composed a work, in view of such a restoration, to warn those responsible for the change against the errors committed in the earlier restoration under Queen Mary. Moreover, if Persons's motive was such as the anonymous writer insinuates, why was he so anxious that Allen should be given authority over the

seminaries; for assuredly the Cardinal would have opposed the acquisition of the property by the Jesuits.¹ Again, even after the Cardinal's death, as late as 1597, Persons was working for the appointment of two English bishops, one to reside on the Continent and the other in England, both of whom would certainly have resisted all claim of the Jesuits to the property of the English seminaries.² Persons must have been singularly stupid, according to the view of the anonymous writer, in thus working against his own end and purpose. In a word, to attribute to Persons the motive insinuated by the writer, quite apart from the fallacious character of the argument, does not accord with the *contemporary facts*.

But more than this, even the premise itself on which the faulty argument is based, is erroneous. The ground on which the Jesuits claimed the property of the Scots College was not that Persons and other members of the Society had helped the College in its foundation, but the much more secure one that, by the latest will of Hippolytus Curle, September 9, 1626, the property was left by him at the entire disposal of the Jesuits.³ In conclusion, we may pertinently ask the writer—Did the Jesuits, in fact, ever claim the property of Douay or the Spanish seminaries?

Not content with the motive thus considered, the anonymous writer gives a second or alternative one: and again by the method of insinuation, not of proof from evidence. "Their [the ablest defenders of the Appellants] case," he writes, "does not consist of a denial of Father Persons's services, but rather the claim that he gave those services at too great a price." With unconscious humour, he then proceeds to give a quotation which itself expresses doubt of those services; for he continues: "As an example, one might quote

¹ Cf. Persons to Creswell, Dec. 9, 1589, "C.R.S.", xiv., p. 20: "And if ye point might be procured which I wrote to you before, to wit that the head government as well of this seminary [Valladolid] as of others might be in our cardinal I think it would be good." Compare the authority given to the Cardinal by the Bull confirming Valladolid: "Cum nullum firmius praesidium . . .", Bullarium Mainardi, Rome, v., 402. The Bull confirming Seville seminary is almost verbally identical with this, and the same power is conferred on Allen. Father Creswell, S.J., incidentally remarks that it was he who drew up the Bull "Nullum firmius." Cf. his "Defensio," "Stonyhurst Archives."

² Cf. Persons's "Apologie," 102. Tierney-Dodd, III., cxvii. Bibl. Vatic. 6227, pp. 26, 38. "Fifth letter of the Proctors of the Archpriest [Array and Haddock] with account of their pleadings before the Pope's Commission, Feb. 27, 1599," in the first Appeal printed in Law, "Archpriest Controversy," I., 115, 120. Cf. also THE MONTH, 1930, April, p. 352.

³ For the will, cf. Tierney-Dodd, IV., ccxlii. Tierney endeavoured to suggest that it was spurious. His reasoning does not carry conviction. Cf. *ibid.* and pp. 125 ff.

Dodd's 'The Secret Policy of the English Society of Jesus,' pp. 57—58. 'Now if upon other occasions afterwards Father Persons ever was the man who used his Interest to benefit the College [Douay] in procuring Donations, and excited the King of Spain to settle a Pension upon it (*which cannot easily be made to appear*),¹ that Pension was but a very slippery Foundation, only paid for a few years, and has been intermittent ever since Dr. Worthington was President of the College, which is an evident Token upon what Account it was paid, viz—to support the Jesuits Interest, whilst they had a Finger in the Pye, and enjoyed the Privilege of furnishing the Clergy with what Superiors they pleased. For when the Economy was changed there was no more to be heard of the Spanish Pension '."

Let it be remarked, *en passant*, that many documents concerning the Appellants and Father Persons have come to light since the first half of the eighteenth century when Dodd wrote, and even since Canon Tierney edited and corrected Dodd's "Ecclesiastical History." To draw one's knowledge of the Appellants merely from Dodd is to be misinformed; the contemporary documents must be consulted, many of which are now printed, and most, though not all, referred to by the modern authorities already cited; still less can reliance be placed on Dodd's "Secret Policy," which, to be frank, is merely a polemical pamphlet.² But let this pass.

The writer's argument, based on the rather obscure quotation from this work, is so far as I understand it as follows. Worthington saw eye to eye with the Jesuits and was made President of Douay, let it be supposed, by their intervention. After a visitation of the College, he was superseded by Kellison, who did not favour the Jesuits, and whose appointment was not due to their influence. The Spanish pension forthwith ceased. Hence the Jesuits in helping Douay only did so that they might intervene in the appointment of its Superiors. Therefore, Persons, some thirty years earlier, in obtaining the Spanish pension, was moved by the same motive, viz., to gain influence for the Society over Douay. Here again it is the same method of insinuation. Bold state-

¹ Italics mine. I have shown Persons did obtain the pension. Cf. THE MONTH, 1931, March, p. 196, and references there given. Cf. also, "Worthington to the Archpriest [Birkhead]," 1609. Tierney-Dodd, V., cv.

² Printed in 1715.

ment without one atom of proof; least of all from contemporary documents. There is the same appeal to an event after Persons's death—the cessation of the pension after Kellison superseded Worthington—to ascribe an unworthy motive to his work thirty years earlier, *viz.*, in 1583, when he first obtained the pension for Douay from the Spanish King, a motive be it remarked unsuspected by Persons's contemporary Allen, with whom he was working in close co-operation.¹ Ten years later, again, Allen wrote of him, "he has always been my most faithful helper in supporting the common cause of our country and of God."² In addition, the argument contains the old fallacy, *post hoc, ergo propter hoc*—the cessation of the Spanish pension occurring after Kellison's superseding of Worthington, and therefore, it is argued, on account of it: the cardinal point being quietly assumed without a vestige of proof that it was the Jesuits who were responsible for the cessation. There is no effort on the part of the writer to find what contemporaries thought of the matter. Kellison, in fact, who succeeded Worthington, and who, had he thought the Jesuits responsible, would not have hesitated to say so, explicitly exonerated the Jesuits and ascribed the non-payment of the pension to its proper cause, namely, the neglect of the inferior officers of the Spanish Crown,—even as Worthington had done before him.³ Nor is any attempt made to view the fact in the light of contemporary circumstances. There had always been difficulties about the payment of Spanish pensions, whether to the exiles in Flanders, the Nuns of Sion, the Seminary of Douay, or the Jesuit College of St. Omer's.⁴ Even under Barrett and Worthington, who succeeded him as President of Douay, years went by without the payment of the pension;⁵ and in the period im-

¹ Allen wrote to Aquaviva saying how much Persons was helping. Cf. Aquaviva's expression of pleasure at this co-operation. Aquaviva to Allen, July 15, 1584. "Archives, S.J., Gall., Ep. Gen.", f. 56. Cf. THE MONTH, 1931, March, pp. 196 ff.

² March 15, 1593. Knox, "Allen," p. 346. Cf. Fitzherbert, "Life of Allen," *Ibid.*

³ Cf. Kellison to Pett (*alias* Clark), July 29, 1613, Tierney-Dodd, V., pp. clxxxvii ff. "Kellison's Report on the Colleges," 1622. "C.R.S." (Burton-Williams), "Douay Diaries." Cf. "Worthington to Archpriest," 1609, *ut supra*.

⁴ Cf. THE MONTH, May, 1931, pp. 414, 416, where the authorities are given.

⁵ Cf. Persons's letter of 1594, "C.R.S.", xiv., p. 22, concerning the obtaining of the arrears. In 1597 Barrett wrote to Agazarri that the pension had not been paid for two years and three months. Barrett to Agazarri, Jan. 4, "Archiv. West.", vi., f. 5. Under Worthington it was paid in 1601. Cf. Persons's "Apologie," p. 25v. Worthington, "Sixteen Martyrs," 1601, p. 76. Yet in 1609 Worthington

mediately succeeding Worthington's replacement by Kellison, when the Douay pension is said to have ceased, there was a default of payment also in the pension granted to the Jesuit College of St. Omer's.¹

Not only, however, is the writer's argument illogical, the method faulty in itself and condemned by the standard in historical writing of to-day, but the premise on which the whole is based, viz., the cessation of the pension of Douay on Kellison's succeeding Worthington as President,—this very premise itself is an assumption on the part of Dodd for which no proof is given. If the cessation of payment means the repudiation of the pension, or that, as soon as Kellison became President there appeared as regards it some new feature unknown under the regime of his predecessor, it may be safely challenged. What the anonymous writer must show, is that the pension was paid so long as Worthington was President of Douay and ceased altogether as soon as he was superseded by Kellison; and let the evidence be brought from the contemporary sources. Kellison, himself, indeed, was quite unconscious that the default in payment when he became President was different from previous defaults.² Certainly from Dodd's more sober work, the "Ecclesiastical History," it would appear that Kellison had no idea that the pension had ceased on his appointment; for when six years later, in 1619, the secular clergy had their own agent in the Court of Spain, this agent, Thomas More, laboured "to procure an order for the arrears due to the College from the Court of Spain."³ Thus Dodd himself, on the strength of the contemporary letter of More to Kellison, March 2, 1619. Despite, however, the influence that More exercised in the Court as regards the intended Spanish Match, he was able to effect little in the matter of the pension. Still, from the documents of the Vatican Archives quoted by Guilday, it

wrote: "For want of payment of the Catholic Kings of Spain his ordinary alms for five years past which cometh to 10,000 ducats [nearly three thousand pounds sterling], we were lately in debt [above two thousand pounds sterling] but now we have received 4,000 ducats, etc." "Worthington to Archpriest," *ut supra*.

¹ Default of payment is noted from the contemporary papers and letters by a later procurator or bursar in the following years: 1594, 1595, 1596, 1605, 1610, 1614-1620, 1625. "Cardwell's Transcripts," II., 107, 114. "Stonyhurst MSS.," A., iv., 13.

² Kellison to Pett, *alias* Clark, July 29, 1613, *ut supra*. Cf. also his "Report on the Colleges," 1622, *ut supra*, and Tierney-Dodd, V., p. 69.

³ Dodd, "Ecclesiastical History," 1739, II., pp. 389-390.

would seem that in fact some payment at least of the pension was made after Kellison's appointment as President.¹

To sum up. The argument by which the anonymous writer endeavours to ascribe this second motive to Persons in the assistance he afforded Douay—for that is the whole question at issue,—is illogical; the method unhistorical, and the premise a mere unsupported assumption which appears at variance with the contemporary evidence. One may, perhaps, not be altogether astonished at this in a polemical pamphlet of the early part of the eighteenth century, but one may well be surprised to find it used by a modern writer when criticizing conclusions based on the contemporary records to which full references were given. To-day, in history as in the Law Courts, it is evidence that is required not mere insinuation, based though the insinuation be on a polemical pamphlet written one hundred years after the events.

LEO HICKS.

¹ I have been unable as yet to consult these documents. But Guilday cites one of 1626—Kellison was still President of Douay at the time—and says for over four years the College received nothing from Spain. Had, however, nothing been received since Kellison's appointment, 1613, "over four years" would be a strange understatement, quite at variance with the purpose of the writer of the document, viz., to expose the financial straits of Douay and thus obtain help for it. Cf. Guilday, "English Refugees on the Continent," p. 318, note 3, at the end of the note.

THE ONE DOGMA OF ANGLICANISM

DR. BARNES, the Anglican Bishop of Birmingham, continues to exercise what we may call his providential function of reminding the Establishment of its essentially Protestant character, and this he does by denying, in season and out of season, the Catholic doctrine of the Real Presence, and supporting his denial by Anglican formularies. These certainly seem to exclude specific Catholic teaching. It is well known that, under the free-thought system of Anglicanism, one may hold any theory about the Eucharist that seems good to one, except the Catholic. The Anglican Church, left obviously and utterly in the dark as to whether Lutheranism, Calvinism, Zwinglianism, or any of a dozen other surmises about the method of Christ's Eucharistic presence is true, nevertheless, claims to be certain that the explanation which Trent says "is aptly and accurately called Transubstantiation," is not. It is the one dogma, characteristically a negative one, of that non-teaching Church—"the fundamental negation," as Father Rickaby calls it, "of Protestantism,"¹ and it was the fear that the Revised Prayer Book tended in some way to go back on that cherished disbelief that was the real reason of its rejection by Parliament. In the Book of Common Prayer the last rubric concerning the Communion Service explicitly declares that, by the act of kneeling, "no adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the Sacramental Bread or Wine there bodily received, or unto any Corporal Presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood. For the Sacramental Bread and Wine remain still in their natural substances, and, therefore, may not be adored (for that were idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians), and the natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are in Heaven and not here."² On this statement, as well as on the 28th Article which asserts that Transubstantiation "is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament and hath given

¹ "Substance and Transubstantiation," THE MONTH, Sept., 1928, p. 226.

² Like most Anglican doctrinal explanations, this Rubric is open to many interpretations, but Dr. Darwell Stone, in his excellent "History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist" (Vol. II., p. 142), says that "historically considered [*i.e.*, having in view its authors and purpose], the declaration added by the Council to the Book of 1552 must be regarded as a denial of the doctrine that the consecrated Sacrament is the body and blood of Christ."

occasion to many superstitions," the Bishop of Birmingham takes his stand. He will have nothing to do with the various explanations of the mode of the Divine Presence, with which Anglican theologians have been occupied from the first: indeed, he seems so strangely ignorant of those voluminous writings, and of the fact that the language of the Articles and of the famous Black Rubric is intentionally ambiguous, and so unaffected by the present views of thousands of his fellow-Churchmen, that one suspects that he is governed by some *a priori* principle which he takes as an indisputable axiom, blinding his mind to all other considerations.

The matter has been thrashed out in the public Press, the usual arena for Anglican disputes, during the past few months, the occasion being the refusal of Dr. Barnes to institute a certain Mr. Simmons to St. Aidan's, a Birmingham church, unless the latter pledged himself to abandon the "Anglo-Catholic" practices, especially that of Reservation, of which that church had hitherto been the home.¹ The patrons of the living appealed to the High Court, which summoned, although in vain, the Bishop to argue his case before it, and then proceeded, equally in vain, to order him to admit the clerk in question. The contumacious prelate might have been tried and imprisoned for contempt, but the patrons preferred to appeal through the Court to the Primate, and, accordingly, the latter was empowered to institute to the benefice over the head of the diocesan Bishop. In explaining his action to Dr. Barnes, the Archbishop, not unnaturally, called attention to the inconsistency of the Bishop's action in invoking the law to coerce his clergy whilst refusing to acknowledge its obligations on himself, and further reproached him for narrowing the sense of the 28th Article. "Is it just, is it charitable [he asked] to brand as mere superstition a belief, whatever you yourself may think about it, which is held by multitudes of your fellow-Churchmen, and which is consistent with the formularies of the Church?" Thus he arraigns Dr. Barnes, not on a charge of false doctrine—no authority in the Church has ever ventured to do that—but for a fault which every Church authority is always ready to denounce—that of trying to make Anglican doctrine definite, certain and exclusive, and thus destroying its unique Note of Comprehensiveness.

¹ St. Aidan's, Small Heath, is one of the 13 "rebel" Churches in the Birmingham district whose incumbents refuse to accept the Bishop's ruling concerning Eucharistic practice.

However, firm in the support of "torrents of letters" and many "expressions of sympathy," backed, moreover, by a considerable section of the religious Press, evangelical and modernistic, encouraged by a memorial signed by many of his clergy, which represents him as much more tolerant in practice than he is in theory, the Bishop, on July 22nd, made a further and stronger appeal to the Primate, professing to find in the latter's admission that an Anglican may believe in "a spiritual presence in the consecrated elements of Holy Communion," a statement "the most seriously disquieting of any made by an Archbishop of Canterbury since the Reformation." "I beg your Grace [he concludes] to withdraw the dangerous implications of your statement. The Church of England must again repudiate the belief which that statement seems to countenance, or the people of England will not heed us when we proclaim the Gospel, for they will deem us disloyal to truth." We must confess that here the Bishop's rhetoric does not ring true. The people of England, who number some 40,000,000, including, perhaps, 2,500,000 Anglican communicants, have long been singularly unconcerned as to the sense in which this or that English prelate interprets Article 28. They do not share the certainties of Bishop Barnes, nor his zeal for the truth. Nor do they normally look to the English Church for intellectual or moral guidance. It is in the course of this letter that the Bishop discloses the reason, on the strength of which he considers his Eucharistic tenets to be the only sound ones. "The true Anglican doctrine of Holy Communion [he asserts pontifically] is surely that the bread and wine are, to speak metaphorically, the vehicles or channels of spiritual grace. Through their use, Christ comes to the devout worshipper. *We know this fact is true because we have experience* [italics ours]. Similarly, the beauty that is in God has been revealed to us in a sunset." The Bishop, for all his strong convictions, does not shine in theological definition: this, his exposition of Article 28, is even foggiest than the original. The similitude he uses to help out his meaning is lame to a degree, for though we apprehend, by a rational inference, something of the Creator's beauty from the loveliness of creation, it is difficult to see why "similarly" the "use" of material bread and wine should convey to us "spiritual grace." However, he will by no means admit anything savouring of the Real Presence. "Your Grace," he exclaims in pious horror,

"the assertion that a priest, by the act of consecration, can cause Christ to come to dwell within the bread and wine of Holy Communion is the so-called 'miracle of the Mass.' It [? the assertion] was a crucial issue at the Reformation, and is the source of most of our present irregularities in public worship. . . Men were not burned at the Reformation because they doubted whether the philosophy of transubstantiation was adequate, but because, under the influence of the enlightenment of the Renaissance, they denied the alleged fact which the philosophy attempted to explain."

The Bishop is right in saying that the Reformers abolished the doctrine of the Mass in the Church they set up in England, and he might have added that the State put priests to death not because they favoured the philosophy underlying the theory of Transubstantiation, but because they acted on the belief that God-made-man was actually present under the appearances of the duly consecrated Bread and Wine. But the Reformers, the better to carry with them men of varying beliefs, hid their real purpose and achievement under ambiguous formularies, and though they—those of them that counted in the settlement—would have agreed with the Bishop in stating that "the belief that a spiritual presence can be made to inhere in a piece of bread is false," they did not explicitly say so. On the other hand, they would have laughed to scorn the Bishop's grounds of denial, which are those of the rationalist pure and simple. "To say that something exists, though no one can detect its existence, receives curt incredulity to-day from thinking men and women." He does not seem to realize that such a standard of proof would involve rejecting all revelation that is beyond the scope of merely human knowledge. Apparently, he would bring everything to the test of sensible experience, as he explains in the sentence italicized above. Yet, although he professes to know that he receives "spiritual grace" from Communion because he feels he has, he derides, almost in the same breath, the same experimental knowledge of Our Lord's presence on the part of the devout communicant. Of course, to make experience the test either of Our Lord's presence in the Sacrament or of the grace conveyed by it, is to do away with the virtue of Faith. Catholics believe in the Real Presence because Christ has said that, *positis ponendis*, He is in the Eucharist. Nor is the grace conferred by any Sacrament primarily a matter of sensible perception : its presence is in-

tellectually known through our belief that God confers it when the requisite conditions are verified. This is elementary Catholic doctrine, of which Dr. Barnes is wholly unconscious. On his own showing, he does not know whether the rite of Baptism produces any effect.

Of course, in his appeals to his Primate, the Bishop has said nothing more than, indeed not so much as, he has often said before, in his endeavours to recast what he thinks to be the theology of his Church, in accordance with what he imagines to be the facts of science. As long ago as October 6, 1927, he denounced the Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist, and threw contempt on its upholders, in terms just as devoid of taste, understanding and logic as his words are to-day. We commented then on his "running true to form,"¹ and we now record his unchanged views only in order to show that, wholly subversive of Christian teaching as they are, they can claim to represent Anglican doctrine, and that it is possible to be a Bishop of the Church of England and a dogmatic rationalist at the same time. We repeat, neither the late Archbishop of Canterbury nor the present nor any authority in that singular Church, has ventured to say—what Dr. Barnes does not hesitate to say of beliefs opposed to his—that his tenets are false and unChristian. If any such condemnation were uttered, still more if it were attempted to depose him as a heretic by process of law, nearly the whole of Anglicanism would rise in his support, for, as the Bishop of Durham so appositely says,—"How could the Church of England exercise her comprehensiveness, so rightly valued, if profound disagreements did not exist amongst her members? It is the duty of us Bishops to maintain this characteristic of our Church." If Dr. Barnes's utterances are resented, it is not because they neatly synopsize most of the chief heresies, and abandon the chief points of Christian Tradition, but because he dares to say—"what I teach is true and the other beliefs tolerated in the Church are false." He rejects not only Transubstantiation, but also all the alternatives which Anglicanism welcomes in its place. So the Archbishop of Canterbury tells him that he is unjust and uncharitable, but refrains from saying he is wrong.

The letters to the Press provoked by these two protagonists are of interest to Catholics chiefly as illustrating into what subtleties of exposition Anglican apologists are led by

¹ See "The Consistency of Dr. Barnes," *THE MONTH*, Nov., 1927.

their devotion to their one dogma—"Transubstantiation is false." Bishop Strong of Oxford who, with a parochialism singular in his surroundings, describes Aristotelianism as "obsolete," cleverly tried (*Times*, July 27th), to put Catholics and Dr. Barnes in the same category, as alike seeking to express universal religious experience in terms of transitory thought. But the Church does not profess to expound in her dogmas mere religious experience, but objective divine revelation. She finds the Aristotelian distinction between "substance" and "accidents" a convenient way of explaining her doctrine concerning the divine Presence, but even if Aristotle had never existed, the facts would have demanded some such explanation of the Eucharist. When Our Lord said, "This is my Body," there was no change perceptible in the piece of bread He held: its appearance, all its external qualities, remained the same. Therefore, if it was His Body, the change must have taken place in what underlies appearances—call it substance as contrasted with accidents, or noumenon as distinct from phenomenon, or use whatever other terms you will. Equally obviously if His Body was there, it was a Body stripped of its perceptible properties and existing in a non-natural state. This follows, whatever philosophical terms we use to explain it, *if* what He said was true. Those who deny its literal truth, must deny His power, or the intrinsic possibility of the change expressed, or His sincerity, or, finally, say that He must have been speaking metaphorically. These do not concern us at the moment. But those who hold that He meant what He said and said what He meant cannot, whatever their philosophical views, explain the occurrence otherwise. What was bread is now a human body: but it still retains the appearance of bread, and has not assumed the appearance of a man: therefore, the change has occurred in regions beyond the range of physical perception. If matter consists only of the sum of its sensible qualities, as Locke and his followers maintained, then, of course, any change which occurred could not but be discernible by the senses. "This," as Father Rickaby observes, "is all the philosophy that is required by the Church's belief in Transubstantiation. You are not called upon to run the whole length of mediaeval scholasticism. Thomas Aquinas is not in the Creed."¹ Granting that there is a reality underlying transient and changeable qualities, by virtue of which reality a

¹ *Loc. cit.*, p. 229.

thing is what it is—and sound thought is hardly possible without such assumption—then all that the Church defines is that a change of what underlies the appearances of bread, leaving those appearances unaltered, into what underlies the appearances of Christ's Body takes place by Divine power when the words of consecration are duly pronounced. This is the only explanation which is in strict accord with the revealed facts, and, if it happens also to accord with the Aristotelian division of material things into substance and accidents, the permanent and the transitory, the argument only indicates the sound common-sense character of that division. Neither Bishop Strong nor any other Protestant can find in any other system of philosophy an intelligible explanation of what Christ effected by His creative words at the Last Supper; consequently, they either take refuge in a reverent nescience, which is silent even as to whether Christ is in the Eucharist or not, or, like Bishop Barnes, boldly deny any Presence, or, like Luther, say that He is there along with the bread, a theory which involves a host of difficulties of its own, or, like Cranmer, that He is there by His moral influence, just as in Baptism, or, like Calvin, that He is there only to the believer, and so on.

On the data furnished by revelation and Faith, Catholic theologians have elaborated the conditions and consequences of this unique and mysterious Event which involves so many interferences with the ordinary laws of matter, and reveals such potentialities of material substances as we should never otherwise have guessed. But, while keen minds endeavour to push ever further into this region of mystery, ordinarily Catholics are content with the knowledge that God Incarnate is "really, truly and substantially" present in the consecrated Host, without investigating the unimaginable method of His abiding. Christ is present—Body and Blood, Soul and Divinity—not as He was before His resurrection, not as He is now in Heaven—but after the fashion of a spirit, not circumscribed by space, not tangible, not divisible, whole in every Host and in every fragment: a unique manner of existence effected by a unique process. So Catholics believe, on the revelation of God's word, and have the merit, of which Bishop Barnes would deprive his flock, were the Anglican Eucharist a true Sacrament, of believing without seeing.

Few Anglican disputes run their course without a contribution, or several, from the venerable Bishop Knox, a repre-

sentative of the old true-blue Protestants, who know that there was a complete break with Catholicity at the Reformation, and resent the constant attempts made to bring back the discarded doctrines, especially those concerning Mass and Holy Communion. On this occasion he takes the Archbishop to task (*Times*, July 29th), for omitting the word "only" in quoting the 28th Article, and thus perverting its meaning. "There can be little doubt that the word 'only' . . . was intended to deny any presence of Christ attached to the elements." But if there is any doubt, the Bishop should know, then the Anglican faithful are free to take advantage of it, and even he grants that the Article, with the word "only" qualifying the manner of reception, "seems thereby to exclude, far more than it asserts, a presence in the elements." Accordingly, whether he likes it or not, it seems to do both!

On the other side, a *Church Times* writer (July 31st) maintains that this remarkable Article—it needs only to be read to see what variety of opinions it was designed to meet—did not condemn the Tridentine doctrine of Transubstantiation, which appeared, indeed, ten years after the first draft of the Article, but only "the gross, repulsive doctrine held by persons at that period: 'the Body and Blood of Our Lord are sensibly, not Sacramentally only, but actually handled and broken by the hands of the priest and ground by the teeth of the faithful.'" No reference is given to the words expressing this doctrine "held by persons [what persons?] at that time." No proof is advanced that there was *prevalent* in the Catholic Church at any time the cannibalistic error suggested by the doubt of the Capharnaites—"How can this Man give us His Flesh to eat?" From the wording of the passage it would seem to be an inaccurate version of an abjuration of his denial of the Real Presence signed by Berengarius about five centuries before Trent. Many years ago (1895) Canon Gore, as he then was, published a volume of "Dissertations" in which he espoused the cause of this ancient heretic and endeavoured to justify his attack upon Transubstantiation. In two articles in this periodical, "Canon Gore on the Doctrine of Transubstantiation,"¹ the late Father Richard Clarke, S.J., refuted the Canon at length, and incidentally showed that he too, like the recent *Church Times* writer, had misunderstood the recantation formula. Owing to the shiftiness shown by the heretic, the Roman authorities endeavoured to

¹ THE MONTH, February and April, 1896.

frame the formula to which he was called upon to assent in 1059, in as explicit terms as possible, and so the salient passage runs :

I profess with heart and mouth . . . that the bread and wine which are laid on the altar are, after consecration, not only a Sacrament, but also the true Body and Blood of Our Lord Jesus Christ, and are sensibly handled not only by way of Sacrament, but also in truth, by the hands of the priest and are broken and crushed by the teeth of the faithful.¹

It may be freely admitted that, owing to the possibility of the wrong subject—"Body and Blood" instead of "bread and wine"—being assigned to the verbs "handled," "broken," and "crushed," the latter part of this formula can be, and has been, understood in a materialistic sense. It is, in fact, used by St. Thomas (*Summa. Theol.* III., q. 77. a. 7. ad 3) as an objection to the Catholic doctrine that only the Sacramental species are affected by whatever happens to the Bread and Wine after consecration. But, although we may grant that, before, in course of time, the various terms became more exactly defined, mistaken notions prevailed, especially amongst the ill-instructed, and that this greatest of Sacraments, like every other ordinance of the Church, was sometimes misunderstood and abused by the ignorant and vicious, the official teaching of the Church only varied by becoming more clear.² Abuses have existed from the first : even in St. Paul's days there were great disorders in connection with the reception of Holy Communion. There were well known superstitious practices in the Middle Ages based on the supposed benefit of looking on the consecrated Host. St. Augustine speaks of some who took the same view as the over-hasty disciples at Capharnaum, and thought Our Lord's flesh was consumed as "flesh sold in the shambles."³ Father John Rickaby, in an exhaustive discussion of "The Berengarian Controversy and its Antecedents"⁴ says, in reference to the

¹ A former Archbishop of Canterbury, the great Lanfranc, was one of the earliest champions of Catholic orthodoxy against the heresy of Berengarius. The text of the heretic's recantation may be found in the Archbishop's " *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini* " (P. L. CL. 410-411.)

² Church authorities have always to be on the watch to curb the exuberances of public devotion and to correct the vagaries of individual theologians. The wonder is how, out of such a medley of surmises and inaccuracies, the true doctrine managed to emerge in all its clearness and consistency.

³ *Tract. xxvii.*, in *Joan.*

⁴ *THE MONTH*, April, May, June, 1893.

several professions of orthodoxy which his patient superiors compelled Berengarius to sign after his frequent lapses :

We cannot fail to observe that authorities in the Church forced Berengarius, in the course of his many recantations, to avow some very strongly worded propositions that might be so interpreted as to savour not a little of Capharnaitism, and could be understood in a sound sense only by giving to the words a meaning less full than usual.¹

And he adds, respecting the formula quoted above, "it must be allowed that the words in which he was ordered to proclaim his belief in the Real Presence went beyond what is customary in theological formularies. . . There is a sense in which these words are out of accordance with fact and with the Church's general teaching."

So much, therefore, we may grant to the writer in the *Church Times* : although we have no evidence that, several centuries later, gross materialistic errors concerning the manner of Christ's presence in the Holy Eucharist were widely prevalent in the pre-Reformation Catholic Church in England. If they were, and if the Reformers were only actuated by zeal for orthodoxy in this matter, why did they not quote the recognized Church authorities, St. Thomas and others, so as to re-establish the true doctrine? Clearly, because in this regard they were in sympathy with the heresy of Berengarius and of other later deniers of the Real Presence. The doctrine of Transubstantiation was no new thing at Trent : it was the actual Berengarian controversy which gave rise to the name five centuries before, and it was in constant use all the intervening years, whilst the doctrine itself derives, of course, from the very words of institution. It would be nice to think, as the *Church Times* writer seems to have persuaded himself, that the framers of the Articles were merely following St. Thomas in rejecting a crude misunderstanding of Catholic doctrine which persisted after centuries of ever-clearer exposition by the Church, and which, ignoring the common distinction between substance and accidents, believed that Our Lord was present somehow in the Eucharist as He was on earth before the Resurrection, but a very slight acquaintance with their other utterances shows how vain is that supposition. One of the precise effects of the Berengarian controversy was to make clear that the Eucharistic Body of Christ

¹ THE MONTH, May, 1893, p. 32.

is endowed with such spiritual qualities as put It beyond reach of anything that is done to the appearances which It underlies, and thus to prevent the revival of "Capharnaitic" notions again in the Church.

There is little further to notice in the newspaper debate on this high and sacred subject, as far as it has got—and such discussions never reach a definite conclusion. Many writers deprecated definition—"let everyone abound in his own sense"—an intelligible position in members of a non-teaching Church, but not to be followed by a body instituted to teach all revealed truth and to establish worship on absolute intellectual certainties. If Christ Our Lord actually dwells on earth as truly as He is in Heaven, under the Sacred Species, surely this is a fact of wholly unique importance to His followers, not to be left in a region of uncertainty and doubt, precisely because of the homage it necessarily demands. Yet as one of her prelates has said, referring to whether Christ is really present in the Eucharist—"The Church of England has not answered that question,"¹ and another Archbishop, son in blood and doctrine to the former, replied to a question put to him by Lord Cushendun in *The Times*—"Is there any change in the bread and wine after the consecration?" explicitly as follows—"Most of us were brought up to believe that the wisdom of the Church of England consists partly in her absolute refusal to give a dogmatic answer to the question."² Whether that refusal is a shrewd sign of wisdom or a miserable confession of incapacity, the judicious will determine. Still, the strange phenomenon, which we noted at the start, deserves to be kept in mind. This Elizabethan Church, in doubt as to what Christ's revelation on this all-important subject means, is yet perfectly certain that another Church is wrong. "Our own Church has never attempted to formulate its [Eucharistic] belief . . . it has condemned Transubstantiation and Zwinglianism: and between these limits it has admitted that our belief is free."³ What is, one inclines to wonder, the precise value of such condemnation?

JOSEPH KEATING.

¹ Archbishop Temple of Canterbury. *Charge*, Oct., 1898. Earlier in the same year, in April, Dr. Temple replied to a correspondent: "The bread used in the Holy Communion is certainly not God, either before Consecration or after, and you must not worship it" (See *Tablet*, Aug. 8, 1931, p. 186). However, the *Church Times*, July 31, p. 132, quotes him as maintaining that the Real Presence is an open question in Anglicanism.

² Archbishop Temple of York. Letter to *The Times*, March 18, 1927.

³ Bishop Headlam of Gloucester, in "Doctrine of the Church," p. 275.

MISCELLANEA

I. CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL NOTES

A MODERN ESTIMATE OF ST. IGNATIUS.¹

“I HAVE just finished reading the MS. of Christopher Hollis’s *St. Ignatius*. It has astonished me and moved me to an enthusiasm that will have the book printed, bound and published inside a month.” So wrote Mr. F. J. Sheed in the May number of his quarterly, *This Publishing Business*. Now, anyone who has had anything to do with the production of books knows that the “P” which stands for Publisher stands also for Procrastination—and, some might add, for Pusillanimity! To find a Publisher, therefore, so far forgetting himself as to make it stand for Precipitation was a Phenomenon, not to say a Portent! One awaited with interest and curiosity the appearance of the book, an anticipation which its perusal has not disappointed, yet which makes reviewing it in a calm and judicial spirit not an easy task.

For it is a biography that will inevitably arouse strong and probably mixed feelings in the minds of many. It is essentially a “modern” biography. Mr. Hollis tells us himself that his “interest is in a psychological rather than an historical problem” (p. 2), and that, wherever he has come across St. Ignatius “doing things which we, normal people of England, not only do not do but even do not think ourselves under obligation to do, I have tried to discover and to explain why it was that St. Ignatius did this thing” (p. 5). The discoveries he makes and the explanations he essays are given us in a series of digressions on such varying topics as the meaning of the term “gentleman” (p. 11) : Rabelaisian talk (pp. 58, 112) : Sex Psychology (pp. 17, 71) : Learning (pp. 75, 265) : the Paradox of Christian values (pp. 87, 166, 287) : the Question of Scandal (p. 90) : the Place of Art in the Church (p. 150 sqq.) : Jealousy between Religious Orders (p. 209), and between Catholics (p. 253) : the Rights of Parents (p. 264), etc., etc. In fact, we have here a compendium, as it were, of Mr. Hollis’s views on a multiplicity of subjects, many of them burning problems of the day, and, whether we share his views or not, it is impossible not to be interested in his candid and entertaining discussion of them. But as one reads one begins to wonder whether, even for an avowedly psychological biography, the treatment is not rather “over-subjectivized.” On the peg of Ignatius Mr. Hollis has hung not only his hat, but his coat and his scarf as well.

¹ *St. Ignatius*. By Christopher Hollis. London : Sheed and Ward. Pp. x. 287. Price, 7s. 6d. n. 1931.

Constructively, the book is a masterpiece of historical compression. In fewer than three hundred pages the author has given us not only an account, adequate to his purpose, of the life of Ignatius, but an amazingly vivid picture of the condition of the Church in his day, together with masterly summaries of the European history of the period, in so far as it touches upon his subject. In this respect Mr. Hollis's study of St. Ignatius is reminiscent of Father Brodrick's great historical biography of another famous Jesuit, Saint Robert Bellarmine, a work which contains so much of permanent value to Church historians, Catholic and non-Catholic alike. In our own day there are few matters on which it is so well worth our enlightening ourselves and our fellow-Catholics as the influence of the Church and of the Papacy in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. There are still a number of Catholics who protest against what they call the unnecessary washing in public of the Church's dirty linen, in spite of the fact, emphasized by Pope Leo XIII. when he threw open the Vatican archives, that the Church has nothing to fear from the truth. It is now not only impossible to hide awkward facts, but also highly undesirable, since the weakness of the Church's human elements only illustrates the strength of her divine, that the failures of Catholics, even in high ecclesiastical position, to maintain the Gospel standard of morality should be dealt with only by non-Catholic writers. It is right to consult the interests of the weak, but that is better done by instructing them and showing that the sins of individuals do not affect the sanctity of the Church which condemns them, rather than by concealing those transgressions. More harm would be caused by the deliberate glossing-over of blatant abuses, out of a mistaken sense of loyalty, than could arise from a straightforward admission of them such as Mr. Hollis has here given us. Such admissions must needs make sad reading for those who have the honour of God and of His Church at heart, but Our Lord Himself pictured the "Kingdom of Heaven" as a fertile field oversown with tares and warned us that scandals would surely come; it is not for us, therefore, of the twentieth century to seek to conceal ecclesiastical delinquencies in the sixteenth.¹ A right knowledge of the nature of Christ's Church and of the scope and character of the assistance she receives from the abiding presence of the Holy Spirit is the best prophylactic against the shock apt to be caused by the revelation of clerical unworthiness. Mr. Hollis, in dealing frankly with "the Reform in Head and Members," so long called for and at length set on foot by the Council of Trent, is in the best Catholic tradition.

Similarly, in vindicating the principles of Christian asceticism²

¹ For a clear, candid and scholarly treatment of the whole subject in all its aspects, we may refer to Father Thurston's "No Popery!" (Sheed and Ward: 1930).

² The classical defence of Christian asceticism may be found in Professor A. O'Rahilly's "Life of Father William Doyle, S.J." Chapters 6, 7, and 8.

against the "natural man" who confuses it with fakirism, he is accurate in describing it as essentially the outcome of an absorbing love of God, and as necessitated, up to a point, by the Fall of Man. It is only by sacrifice that love becomes articulate and proves its existence. But it is in the Redemption of Man,—the Mystery of the Cross,—that asceticism finds its fullest justification, and on this Mr. Hollis does not touch. Moreover, the complete Catholic doctrine, securely based on Our Lord's words and those of St. Paul, has flourished in the Church since the beginning, yet from the tone of his "apologia" Mr. Hollis would seem to imply that it has somehow fallen into desuetude. It is familiar, nevertheless, to those educated in the Catholic tradition—the vast majority of Christians—as part of their normal training. The "moderns," for whose benefit Mr. Hollis explains the matter, are merely non-Catholics who have never had the chance of learning the true spirit of Christianity. Bodily mortification, such as St. Ignatius practised, is still "common form" throughout the Church, amongst all who aspire to more than obligatory virtue, and the principles which explain and justify it are part of the ordinary Catholic teaching. By identifying himself with those modern Englishmen who find it strange and inexplicable, Mr. Hollis tends to obscure this fact. We are, however, wholly with him in his denunciations of snobbery, of pseudo-nationalism, of materialism, and of that party-loyalty which consists of abuse of other parties. He emphasizes continually the sane Catholic "middle-way" between excess and defect, into which extremes mankind, devoid of God's guidance through the Church, is always apt to fall.

Mr. Hollis's treatment of asceticism, as we have suggested, is accurate as far as it goes, but we cannot, unfortunately, say the same about his disquisitions on matters of sex. He says (p. 58): "There is no subject upon which Christian traditions have been, and are, more utterly divided than that of Rabelaisian talk"—a generalization as exaggerated as it is misleading. If he had said that Christian practice was divided, no one could gainsay him: here, as in all other moral matters, the lax are divided from the observant. But Christian moral teaching regarding "Rabelaisian talk" was expressed once for all by St. Paul, writing to his Ephesian converts—"As for impurity and all uncleanness or cupidity, let it not so much as be named amongst you, as becometh saints,—no, nor filthiness, nor foolish talk nor scurrility: which are not fitting." These words were addressed, not technically to "Saints," but to the ordinary Christian, and the Church has never varied in her endorsement of them: lewd talk is sinful, and she never can condone sin. Mr. Hollis's strange enthusiasm for Rabelais, which, on p. 140, he emphasizes unnecessarily by an oath, seems to have warped his judgment in this regard. It

may be urged that that unworthy priest was merely coarse, making the reading of his romance a matter of taste rather than of morality, and that his abounding humour and zest of life palliate his grossness, but that excuse cannot be maintained. The man is corrupt in essence. For all his wit and wisdom, he had the animal mind of the godless pagan. With the following estimate, which occurs in a review¹ of a recent Life of Rabelais, all decent Christians will surely agree.

Now, while Rabelais surely was one of the great story tellers, the fact is, as every reader will admit who is not concerned with controversy, that grossness and filth in words and ideas were not only grist, but meat and drink to him. The chapbooks and burlesques of his age were foul-spoken according to our view, but Rabelais outvied them all. He seized on the very diction of the stews and latrines . . . and drew on his medical lore and knowledge of languages to invent obscene words of his own . . . He loved them, and revelled in them, quite apart from whether they were suited to this or that character. The stories he savoured most in the telling were those in which he used these words. Before the text of Rabelais the most prurient lavatory-poet pales his ineffectual fires.

It is thus that even secular writers regard the man whom Mr. Hollis dubs "the gorgeous Rabelais," and whom he actually puts in the one category of greatness with St. Ignatius! Surely he has allowed his literary idolatry to run away with him when he exclaims, in allusion to St. Ignatius's supposed "insensitiveness to intellectual pleasures," "What is there sadder or more striking than this total lack of sympathy between the grand spirits of their age, Ignatius and François Rabelais?" (p. 77). Mr. Hollis must not be surprised if others besides the sons of St. Ignatius will deeply resent this association of the Saint, under any pretext, with the name of the prince of anti-religious scoffers and libertines. What fellowship, indeed, hath light with darkness? What harmony hath Christ with Belial?

We repudiate, therefore, Mr. Hollis's implication that "Rabelaisian talk" is innocent, the more so that he embodies his ideas in such perilous counsel as this—"It is far wiser to encourage—or at least to allow—[a boy] to use the safety-valve of easy-going conversation, which pays to sex the important insult of treating it, when jokes are on, as a joke—much the best way of treating it for those who are able safely to do so." At a time when the efforts of all Christian educators are increasingly called upon to keep their charges unstained by the foulness which is met on every side, this advice rings very false. Countless mistakes, we admit,

¹ A. P. Nicholson in *Saturday Review*, March 22, 1930.

are made in giving or withholding sex-education, but no greater could be made than by starting the idea that the fires of impurity can be safely played with, or that—though this, we are sure, is not Mr. Hollis's meaning—little sins can be indulged in so as to prevent greater. For saint and ordinary Christian alike, there is the same standard of obligatory morality, though the saint goes far beyond it.

In his estimate of Blessed Peter Faber's character, again, the author's preoccupation with Freudian psychology seems to lead him astray. He finds fault with the youth's tutor for having taught him the classics "in such a way that his innocence could not possibly be corrupted by anything that he read," but surely that should be the endeavour of all Christian teachers. It does not mean that all knowledge of evil is to be suppressed, but that knowledge should be tempered to the pupil's age and evil shown in its true light. The event proved that habits of virtue were thus deeply rooted in Faber's soul, and that all the seductions of Paris University life were not able to shake them. It is a curious way to describe his preservation of his chastity, fortified by vow, to say—"yet he did not by any means go completely to the bad" (p. 113), and to speak of "his false conscience," as if his vow, made when a boy of twelve, was not valid. God's preventing grace has taken action at even earlier ages than that.

In his acute analysis of St. Ignatius's mentality, we are not sure that Mr. Hollis has not used overmuch the argument from silence. The literary remains of the Saint—apart from the Exercises and the first draft of the Constitutions—are mainly letters of business, letters in which opinions about art or literature or even current affairs would have been out of place. That he loved music, had a taste for romance, even wrote poetry, we know from other sources. That his mind was filled with great schemes for the advancement of God's Kingdom, which might well exclude any dilettante interests, is evident from his achievement. All the same, he had an eye for the beauties of Nature: his "Contemplation for Acquiring Love" is Franciscan in its range: his "Quomodo sorbet tellus dum celum aspicio" shows how he saw God in and through His creation. However, Mr. Hollis makes clear that he knows the real secret of the Saint's comparative apathy to the things of earth as such—a secret, indeed, common to all the Saints: it is that no one wants the creature who has the Creator, and Ignatius was on fire with God. That alone should have suggested a better word than "dour" to express the Saint's "service of the greater glory of God," even in contrast with the spirit of St. Francis. There is nothing "dour" about the high romance of the "Kingdom of Christ" and "Two Standards."

However, when all is said and done, this is a remarkable book, calculated to do much good and, when the blemishes indicated are

removed, (in a speedily-realized second edition) certain to do more. The author has many shrewd and witty phrases at command, as for example, when he shows how "humility has its economic as well as its moral advantages" (p. 183); or tells us that Paul IV. "hated beauty as if it were a Spaniard" (p. 156). "Pious women are a touchy lot," he remarks elsewhere, and he interweaves many good stories with his narrative. And there is learning as well as wit in his pages, and (for all we have said previously) much spiritual insight as well. His concluding chapter—on "The Meaning of Ignatius"—is an admirable sketch of the functions of Sainthood.

CHRISTIANITY WITHOUT DOGMA.

HERE is more "religion" broadcast from the Anglican church of St. Martin-in-the-Fields than from any other church, chapel, or religious institution in England. St. Martin's has been described in the *Radio Times* as "the most popular and important parish church in London," and its popularity and importance are ascribed to the present incumbent, the Rev. "Pat" McCormick and his immediate predecessor, the Rev. "Dick" Sheppard, "both men of broad sympathies, willing to work hand in glove with the most modern instrument of diffusion," the wireless; and the *Radio Times* writer thinks that these two Anglican clergymen prove "the continued vitality of the Church of England."

All this contains a significance greater than may appear superficially. The B.B.C. have broadcast many talks definitely antagonistic to religion and all that religion has stood for in England for more than a thousand years; Christianity has been openly attacked through the microphone; the immortality of the soul, the moral law, the divinity of Christ, the existence of God—all have been the subject of talks, either single or as part of a series or symposium, utterly destructive in their trend and in their effect. In defence of this policy the B.B.C. have claimed that the speakers were not "anti"-Christian, but mere "non"-Christian (quite unmindful of Christ's own warning that "he that is not with Me is against Me"). And, in any case, say the B.B.C., quite a lot of religion is broadcast, and we must give both sides a fair hearing; furthermore, listeners are entitled to hear the views of men representative of "modern thought." This attitude implies that there is a *case against Christianity*, otherwise there would be no reason at all for admitting to the microphone men whose views run counter to the teachings of Christ. It further implies that Christianity is merely a cult which has to fight for its place among all the other cults in the arena of public debate; it has certainly proved to be rather a big influence for two thousand years, therefore it must be given a sporting chance to prove its

continued worth; so a considerable proportion of talks and Sunday services are included in the B.B.C. programmes to give the Christian "side" fair play.

Now among what may be termed the pro-religion broadcasts the addresses delivered from St. Martin-in-the-Fields easily take first place in numbers. Therefore, we are entitled to assume that the B.B.C. consider these broadcasts as quite representative of Christianity in England; showing it at its truest and best; being, in a word, Christianity's expert witness. This being so, we are entitled to investigate what sort of case is presented. Judging from the many addresses delivered by the Rev. Mr. Sheppard, and having the Rev. Mr. McCormick's book, embodying his recent six monthly broadcast talks on "Christ's message to us to-day" before us, the result of the inquiry is not comforting; it leads inexorably to the conclusion that St. Martin's popularity is due to the fact that it stands for and preaches the very popular religion of humanism. And humanism is not Christianity.

The sincerity and good intention of St. Martin's preachers are not for one moment doubted. It is quite certain that Mr. McCormick believes exactly what he says when he emphasizes "fellowship" as the keynote of Christianity. Yet to place mere fellowship on such a lofty plane is surely to distort the teachings of Christianity. "Get together and work together is the message as I see it to which God is calling Christians to-day." Christianity is not "pulling its weight," and it can only do so "if Christians and men of good will get together and work together to build the kingdom of God." And this is to be accomplished notwithstanding the widest divergence in doctrine and interpretations of the moral law! For Mr. McCormick thinks that "the Church" is merely "the fellowship of Christians," and that, in spite of fundamental differences on the most vital points of faith and consequently of conduct, Christians of all shades of belief can somehow be "got together" to influence world opinion on the great moral issues and so build "the kingdom of God." What does Mr. McCormick understand by this expression? It is to be feared that his goal is the material one of the humanist rather than the spiritual goal of the true Christian: "It is to this greater fellowship in Christ to which I believe God is calling us to-day . . . to work together on great *international and social questions*" . . . "the reduction of armaments" . . . "international co-operation" . . . "Covenants, Pacts, and the Moratorium to save the world from financial disaster" . . . "the international bank—things which, twenty years ago, would have been thought impossible; we thank God for the Christian spirit which has been revealed in them." To see the Christian spirit revealed in the workings of the international financiers, who are more Jewish than Christian, is a feat of which we are wholly incapable. "But," continues the preacher, "how

much more might happen if only Christians could be got together." This "get-together" seems to be an obsession with Mr. McCormick (on one page he mentions it 6 times in 18 lines), and so far as it represents a desire to see men united in action for the common welfare of mankind, it is entirely praiseworthy, but it is not the keynote of Christianity or the essential ingredient of Christ's message to us to-day; no doubt it is the central idea of the religion of St. Martin's, one which Mr. McCormick would like to see adopted by his listeners and his readers, but it is quite certain that it is not Christianity. The keynote of Mr. McCormick's religion would appear to lie in his own expression: "Get together and work together is the message as *I* see it." Quite so; as Mr. McCormick sees it; nothing more nor less than a personal opinion, with nothing to back it but the conviction of the excellent, but possibly mistaken, man who holds it. It is only a small fragment of the message conveyed by Christ's Gospel as interpreted by Christ's Church.

Mr. McCormick's idea of the Church as "the fellowship of Christians" is a piece of loose thinking typical of the confusion resulting from four centuries of Protestantism. A fellowship of men holding diametrically opposed views on matters affecting one's eternal salvation, on fundamental principles of faith and morals, is a strange sort of fellowship to hold up as the ideal at which the world should aim in order to "make the witness of Christianity effective" and to "rouse public opinion on great moral issues."

But Mr. McCormick has thought of that and attempts to deal with the difficulty. "Even if it is true that we cannot worship together or see eye to eye theologically . . . other Churches may be the hands or the brain while we are the feet in the Body of Christ." But when the hands point one way while the feet go another what has become of those ancient guiding principles—"He that heareth you heareth Me," and "Go and teach all nations . . . all things whatsoever I have commanded you."? These injunctions point to something very different from the queer combination Mr. McCormick would have us join, in which the voice would give one direction, the hands point to another, and the feet carry us somewhere else. He insists to the verge of monotony on the necessity of "Christians getting together" to influence decisions on the great moral questions which confront the world. How does he expect men to unite, to get together, on great moral issues where there is no unity of faith? Quite recently we had an example of what happens when men professing Christianity do get together in this way to discuss a great moral question. The bishops of Mr. McCormick's Church assembled at Lambeth and discussed the great moral issue of birth-control. They fulfilled Mr. McCormick's conditions to the letter. They

were Christians, although some of them could not see eye to eye theologically, and they had "got together." And we all know the pathetic failure of that assembly to give a definite lead or even to agree on that vastly important moral problem. They compromised. And nothing else could be expected from the deliberations of men brought together in such circumstances, with no stronger binding tie than Mr. McCormick's "spirit of fellowship," and with no recognition of any sure guide.

Clearly, the case for Christianity put up by the B.B.C.'s champions will not do. Under the guise of fellowship it is a brand of religion likely to prove popular, as the popularity of St. Martin's shows; but just because it is not Christianity it is dangerous and misleading. Mr. McCormick's case for Christianity is, to say the least, singularly unhappy. We can well picture the glee of the Bolshevik when he hears the B.B.C.'s chosen representative of the cause of Christ declare that the Church has not been faithful to her Master. This is the sort of thing the Bolshevik can appreciate and enjoy, for his plan (not the five year plan, but the vastly more important anti-God plan) is the overthrow of organized religion of every kind, and to weaken the case for organized Christianity by broadcasting the Church's "faithlessness" is to play directly into the hands of the enemy.

Perhaps the B.B.C. do not do these things deliberately; perhaps they are only the victims of muddle-headedness, and they "mean well." It may even be that when Mr. McCormick, in the foreword to his book, laments the "extraordinary ignorance of so many people as to what Christianity really teaches" he is thinking of his friends on the British Broadcasting Corporation.

But when one remembers the strange preponderance of anti-Christian propaganda in so very many B.B.C. talks and symposia, and the wide liberty afforded at the microphone to those who would play the Bolshevik's game in England, it is difficult not to suspect the B.B.C.'s good faith. Recalling the *twelve weeks* given to Professor MacMurray in which to cast ridicule on the existence of the Moral Law; and the extraordinary statements even of the representatives of the remaining fragments of Protestantism, such as the injunction: "on no account allow conduct to be regulated by religion" of the Archbishop of York; the declaration by Dean Inge that "the time has now come to discard many of the old dogmas of Christianity," and now Mr. McCormick's definition of the Church as a mere heterogeneous fellowship, faithless to its Master and, therefore, no longer a safe guide or teacher—one can only come to the conclusion that the campaign against God, inaugurated by the Russian Anti-Christ, has been joined by many active, if unreflecting, adherents in this once-Christian land.

T. W. C. CURD.

II. TOPICS OF THE MONTH

The Economic Crisis. If even daily papers cannot foresee the ultimate developments of a grave economic crisis in this country, which changes from hour to hour, a monthly journal must needs confine itself to general reflections thereon, which will remain true whatever the event. The Labour Government, which has perished as we write, claimed to be the victims of uncontrollable economic world-forces, but, although these have had their share in frustrating its every effort to decrease unemployment and foster national prosperity, its own character, projects and acts contributed still more to its general discredit. It was, of course, a Minority Government, unable to do anything which the other parties might combine to prevent, but that did not prevent its putting forward measures of a generally Socialistic character, involving that increasing intervention of the State in the lives of its citizens to which all parties, unhappily, now seem to be committed. But nothing like the full-blown Socialistic programme—the displacement of the private Capitalist system by a State organization, and the substitution of general welfare for private profit as a motive for industry—was, or could have been, attempted by such a Government. It was only able to aim by process of legislation at that wider diffusion of wealth which out-and-out Socialists dream of securing by confiscation. It increased taxation, widened the scope of pensions, raised the rate and lowered the age of unemployment insurance, whilst facilitating access to it. There was nothing markedly Socialistic in Mr. Snowden's two Budgets, although in the second both income-tax and death-duties were increased, and a tax was imposed which assumed national ownership of land, but the most ominous feature of Labour finance undoubtedly was the growth of expense in social services and the reckless borrowing to cover the insolvency, actual and prospective, of the unemployment Insurance Fund. So alarming had this process become, and so open to abuse was the operation of the benefit, that the Government, in order to get power for renewed borrowing, were compelled to set up a Royal Commission to discover how the system could be made solvent and self-supporting, which, in the middle of June, recommended, in an interim Report, a number of drastic proposals for reform. But, instead of "putting the Insurance Fund on an insurance basis," as Mr. Snowden promised (Mansion House speech: October, 1930), the Government shrank from the unpopularity of restricting benefits, and made no appreciable reform.

T.U.C. wants Maintenance without Insurance. It will be remembered that, in its evidence before this Commission on May 4th, the General Council of the Trade Union Congress, which has much more influence in the councils of Labour than similar party-groups can exercise when Liberals or

Tories are in power, proposed the abolition of insurance contributions altogether, and stood out for the nakedly-Socialist scheme of the dole. This proposition, as may be seen in the programme of their approaching Conference, they still advocate. The "State" must provide "work or maintenance": every unemployed person should be paid a maintenance grant, at rates considerably higher than those now existing, drawn from monies to be obtained by a special tax on all incomes, not to exceed one per cent on those under £250, but limited only by the requirements of the fund on all others. The "State" thus turns out to be that small fraction of the population which, through work or fortune, possesses an income. This proposal, of course, illustrates one form of the usual Socialist contention that the community which is responsible for the existence of Capitalism, must also be held responsible for its natural and inevitable results, amongst the chief of which is perennial unemployment. The Poor-Law is an acknowledgement of that responsibility: the State- and Employer-contributions in the present scheme form another: it is clear that no civilized community can allow its members to die of hunger. So put, the force of the argument is incontestable: it is based on the natural law that, in face of extreme necessity, the rights of private property must be waived. But the particular way of solving the difficulty suggested by the T.U.C. is wrong, because it would defeat its own end. It would tend to counteract another law of nature—that a man must, in some way or other, work for his livelihood—by removing all incentive to personal effort. It would relieve the individual of the responsibility of trying to support himself, by assuring him of maintenance in idleness. Mr. MacDonald, writing in 1913, long before his present elevation, pointed out the danger of purely eleemosynary relief.

The one danger ahead [he wrote in "Social Unrest"] is that we shall give them [the unemployed] as a charity the services for which they cannot pay. That, indeed, would be the most terrible of blunders. That would be using national wealth and resources in order to keep these battalions in their present state. The social reformer—especially he who is working to supplant the present economic order by a human one—may give fervent thanks that the Insurance Act was in the main kept on a contributory basis.

It is found by experience that even now the Insurance Scheme is apt to produce deterioration of character, both moral and physical inefficiency. What would be the result of a gigantic system of outdoor relief such as the T.U.C. suggests? Yet, while maintaining the contributory basis of the unemployment benefit, the Labour Government so far followed those suggestions as to draw freely on the wealth of the nation in order to supplement the great and growing deficit in the finance of the Fund.

**Effects
of the "National
Expenditure" Report.**

This weakness was suddenly revealed in its true light to the nation by the publication on July 31st of the report of the Committee on National Expenditure, appointed in accordance with a resolution of the House of Commons to inquire into the possibility of effecting "all practicable and legitimate reductions," in outlay. The Report stated that we were spending at the rate of £120,000,000 in excess of income, and that, "if existing policies remain unaltered," this will be a permanent extravagance. Recommendations followed of very drastic character, including such increase of contributions and decrease of benefit as would save £66,500,000 in the Unemployment Insurance, and a cut of nearly £14,000,000 in expenditure on Education. It was, obviously, the excessive outlay on social services, for which all parties are to blame, that has brought about this critical state of affairs; a failure to realize that, until the colossal financial waste caused by the war had been, to some extent, made good by years of steady productiveness, progress in social betterment must needs be delayed. With a National Debt more than ten times that of 1914, we have, since its close, spent on "social services" more than 4,000 million pounds, *i.e.*, more than half that huge National Debt! What wonder that at last the credit of this wealthy country began to be shaken, and that the Bank of England was exposed to the humiliation of having to accept a loan of £50,000,000 from American and French banks in order to maintain, for the benefit of all parties, the value of sterling. Foreign investors, knowing that "Socialists" were in office, and judging them and their intentions by what they know of the violent Continental type, began to lose their trust in British financial stability. Hence the need of assuring the world that the British Budget would be balanced; in other words, that by some means or other that vast excess of £120,000,000—which may easily turn out to be more—was to be wiped out. No one realized that need more keenly than the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who, as long ago as February 23rd of this year, described in a speech at Slaithwaite the ruinous results of a collapse of British credit:

A Budget deficit is a very serious matter; this country, of all countries in the world, cannot afford a Budget deficit. A deficit in the Budget, which is not met, will destroy confidence both at home and abroad, and the repercussions will be felt nowhere more severely than among the working people.

It would have disastrous consequences upon our exchanges, and you will remember that the whole of our foreign trade and commerce depends upon the maintenance of the exchanges; if the exchanges go greatly against us our foreign trade cannot be conducted; it would mean an increase of the Bank rate, and increased cost of all public borrowing, includ-

ing the borrowing of our local authorities, it would mean higher rates in the discounting of commercial bills, higher rates for bank overdrafts, enormous additions to the present burdens upon industry; all those consequences would follow from an unbalanced Budget.

Accordingly, when the crisis was seen to be acute, the first statement made by the Cabinet Economy Committee was that, at all costs, the Budget would be balanced. The Cabinet split on the methods to be employed, and a Government of all parties was formed.

These economic matters have an interest for us Catholics, not only in as much as we are citizens and perhaps tax-payers, but also because we are thus corroborated in our old conviction that

Socialist principles and assumptions must needs break down when applied to the realities of life. The endeavour to distribute wealth by heavily taxing the comparatively few that possess it, and by using capital as revenue, must cripple and ultimately destroy the means of production upon which all wealth depends. The acceptance of a proletarian "wage-or-dole" status as the normal condition of the bulk of the population shows little appreciation of human dignity. The acquiescence in the invasion of family rights and responsibilities, brought about by growing educational and medical assistance from the State, with further and more questionable interference always threatened, argues a profound ignorance of proper human ideals. Catholics would not thus go astray. One section of *Quadragesimo Anno* is concerned with the "uplifting of the proletariat," by wider diffusion of property of all sorts, and the actual abolition of that wage-slavery of which the T.U.C. complains.¹ Excessive concentration of wealth can best be met by its diffusion: large owners can best be balanced by small owners. It is one of the tragedies of our day that men filled with so genuine a zeal against social injustice and so wholesome a sympathy with its victims, should yet be so blind as to the real remedies. By shutting out from its gaze the guidance and inspiration of religion, Socialism condemns itself to futility. By not seeking first the Kingdom of God and His justice, it cannot find even the earthly goods of its desire.

**The Chief
Stigma on the
Labour Government.**

One proof of this is that not even its political incapacity in home affairs has so injured the prestige of the late Labour Government in the eyes of Christian folk as its allowing narrow class-sentiment and class-prejudice to lead it to condone the hideous im-

¹ "However strong, skilful, capable and willing a worker may be, his ability to get a livelihood depended on whether his labour could be turned to profitable account by someone else." Memorandum of T.U.C. to Commission on Unemployment Insurance.

morality, active atheism and general anti-human policies of Soviet Russia. These abominations have long been made known to all the civilized world, but the Labour Cabinet persisted in officially ignoring them. Yet nowhere is the worker more cruelly treated than in this Soviet slave-State, nowhere are the Christian principles of a fair wage and freedom of contract more absolutely violated, nowhere are conscience and human liberty more brutally invaded, no other country so persists in dumping the products of sweated work on foreign shores, and thus in lowering wages of workers everywhere. Everything that the Labour Socialist contends for—his materialistic ideals of high wages, short hours, and real security—is denied to his class in Russia. Yet nothing was said or done by this British Ministry of Workers during its two years of office to show even formal disapprobation of all these crimes against Labour, lest they should seem to be following the lead of their political opponents and joining in their condemnation of Marxism. Even on their own industrial ground they were false to the cause they professed, but it is when we consider their cowardly silence in face of the war against God and His Christ which is an essential part of the Soviet programme that we feel the fitness of their inglorious end. They have not loved justice and hated iniquity. Accordingly, in spite of their humanitarian zeal and their real services to international peace, the second Labour Government have won no lasting credit.

**The
New Economy
Government.**

The National Economy Ministry which succeeds them will lack no measure of wisdom that a multitude of counsellors can provide. For a month the Press has teemed with suggestions regarding the proper and the wrong methods of reducing expenditure. As a rule, each threatened class is able to show triumphantly that reduction in *its* emoluments would be false economy. On behalf even of the recipients of unemployment benefits it is urged that a lessened dole would mean less purchasing power, and the same argument applies to all wage-reduction. But since commodity prices have been slowly and steadily falling, real wages were increasing proportionately, so people would not necessarily be worse off than they were a few years ago. Public opinion, registered in this fashion in the Press, *i.e.*, mainly by tax-payers, seems to be strongly against any increase of taxation, but there is one suggestion frequently repeated which has much to recommend it, and that is to make the scope of direct taxation as universal as possible, and thus give everyone a direct interest in economy. The poll-tax has not a good name in English history, but it need not be very large, and it could be raised without unfairness. Happily, the mother country has the example of a daughter State before her both as a warning and an encouragement. Australia, under

Labour auspices, had borrowed freely and spent unwisely, till her debt reached the enormous total of £1100,000,000 which, with a population of about 6½ million, represents £173 per head,—that of Great Britain comes to £167 odd per head—and brought her to the brink of bankruptcy. Now, by stringent economy, loan-conversion, sacrifice of salaries, etc., she has escaped that fate and is well on the way to recovery. Thus, on the whole, the auspices are good for the success of the new Government. The real significance of its appearance is that a halt has had to be called to that unwise multiplication of the functions of the State in which all parties have indulged since the war, and which the representatives of all parties have agreed, as far as may be, to discontinue.

Moscow
at
Madrid.

One would have thought that the ill-assorted group of inexperienced men who, by very questionable means, have "consolidated the republic" in Spain, and now preside over a Cortes composed of 22 political parties amongst its 470 deputies, had enough on their hands,—what with the need of controlling the powerful organizations of Communists, forming the "Sindicato Unico," which have been promoting strikes all over the country, and the "regionalists" who, on every side, are claiming autonomy,—without gratuitously attacking the one stable and conservative institution in the country—the Catholic Church. But your anti-clerical pays as little regard to common sense as to justice. He has an unappeasable longing for Church-reform, which means essentially the seizure of Church property. He wants to give the people liberty, and tries, therefore, to free them from the obligations of their own consciences. The new Spanish Government has issued a draft of its proposed Constitution for the country which embodies amongst what are undoubtedly real reforms, articles proclaiming the separation of Church and State, the dissolution of all Religious Orders, and the nationalization of their property, and divorce on mutual demand of the parties. The last provision bears the unmistakable stamp of Moscow, and the whole batch shows how successfully a Catholic people, through its own apathy and the violence of its opponents, has been deprived of Catholic leadership. What is the use of telling us that Señor Zamora is a devout Catholic? He has begun to persecute the Church by banishing, on a dishonest pretext, her chief leader. Catholic is as Catholic does, and this particular one has not even protested against the Soviet anti-Christianity shown in the draft Constitution. We are witnessing again, on a larger and more gradual scale, what happened twenty years ago in Portugal, viz., a diabolical outbreak against God's Church of the forces of evil, disguised as a movement of emancipation from tyranny and obscurantism. Under what possible pretence of justice can confiscation of Church

property be advocated? Why, in the name of liberty, should the voluntary associations of citizens for lawful and salutary purposes, known as Religious Orders, be disbanded and prohibited? The absence of any avowable motive implies that mere covetousness and hatred of the supernatural actuate these cowardly attacks on the defenceless. The British Press judges of these iniquitous proposals, not in the light of their intrinsic nature, but simply according to their effect on public opinion. If Catholics show their resentment, then it is the Church that is quarrelling: if there is no protest, then the measures are in accord with national desires. In a joint Pastoral and a series of individual letters, the Spanish hierarchy, whilst inculcating obedience in things lawful to the Government, has fearlessly criticized the ministerial acts and projects, emphasizing the direct and inexcusable violations of the existing Concordat which they involve. If supported by their flocks, there is no reason why their Lordships' remonstrances should not be effective. Spain, we hope, is still a Catholic country, in spite of Moscow and all its works.

**Moscow
in
Ireland.**

There is no concealment of the fact that certain anti-clerical sections of the Free State population are in close relations with the Soviets. It is to the shame of Irish working men, some 95 per cent of whom are Catholics, that their Trade Unions should be largely directed and inspired by non-Catholics, that their chief non-Parliamentary representative should actually be an official of the Red International, and that their Press, such as it is, should constantly be praising the Bolsheviks. Nowhere more than in Ireland should that magnificent sketch of a Catholic civilization, the Pope's Encyclical on "The Social Order: its Reconstruction and Perfection," be studied and applied, yet there has been no organized welcome of it on the part of either employers or employed. We should be sorry to think that, in Irish industrial circles, either capitalist or Soviet ideals should hold the field, but what gain to the Faith would accrue if industry there could present to the world an object-lesson in the thorough working of Catholic social principles! Furthermore, it is not clear what influences were behind the recent disturbances in Cavan, which caused an outburst of Orange fury in N.E. Ulster, but, in so far as such attacks and reprisals tend to accentuate religious bitterness, and endanger the peace of the country on the eve of the great Eucharistic Congress, they are altogether in keeping with Bolshevik designs. It is much to be regretted that unconstitutional opposition to the Free State Government, which has taken the shape, at times, of cowardly murders, and always keeps alive the menace of armed rebellion, cannot be effectively put down. But political rancour against the Government on the part of the oppo-

sition strikes so deep that it will not lend its help to suppress disorder, whilst its extreme element, the so-called Irish Republican Army, has openly avowed the authorship of the initial outrage. *The Times* (August 18th) comment only states the truth—"Thus Protestants and Roman Catholics were set by the ears for the benefit of an organization suspected of anti-clericalism and numbering amongst its members or allies persons reputed to be in close touch with the Communist International." We feel sure that Catholics in Ireland, having in view the sacredness of next year's celebration, will support the Government in any measure designed to rid the country of this menace to its reputation and its peace.

Financial Stability The upshot of President Hoover's timely position to suspend for a year the payment on the international debts was nothing like what was expected at the start, but the psychological effects of the recognition, by all the great States, of the necessity of preventing Germany's collapse, joined to the friendly visits interchanged between German, French, British and Italian ministers, restored German financial confidence, and enabled the Government to pursue its regime of drastic economy, involving sacrifices far beyond anything likely to be exacted here. The failure of the extremists, the Communists and Hitlerites in evil combination, to procure by plebiscite on August 9th the dissolution of the Prussian Diet has given further prestige to the Bruening Cabinet with its policy of international peace and co-operation. These recurring financial storms, and the awful paradox presented by the unsaleable glut of wheat in America coinciding with widespread starvation in China, is gradually forcing upon the so-called independent States of the world their real unescapable solidarity and the necessity of taking practical measures to give it formal expression. A speaker at the World Social Economic Congress, convened at the Hague by the International Industrial Relations Association on August 24th, foreshadowed "the ultimate stabilization of world industry by a world-scale application of the principles of scientific management." Something certainly is wrong when millions of potential wealth-producers in every land stand idle for want of opportunity to work, when coffee has to be burnt in Brazil, and wheat in the United States, and when British fishermen have to return their catches to the sea because markets are not available, whilst on the other hand, millions elsewhere are sick or dying for want of food. The unregulated pursuit of gain has produced, both nationally and internationally, results so ruinous to humanity that experience has now shown it to be what St. Paul pronounced it, the root of all evil. There is no nation, not excepting the wealthiest of all, which is not suffering from its

effects. It is for the interest of all nations, therefore, to combine in order to control it. But that will hardly be done on merely natural principles.

Catholic Activities.

The last month or so has been crowded with Catholic meetings of various kinds which are a gratifying proof that the duty of "Catholic Action" is appreciated amongst us. The C.S.G.

Summer School at Oxford during the week beginning July 20th discussed, as was natural, the Social Order depicted in *Quadragesimo Anno*, and the need of developing agriculture as a remedy for over-industrialism. The Cardinal Archbishop, speaking at the annual meeting of the Society for the Maintenance of the Apostolic See on July 24th, emphasized the happy divorce of organized Catholicity in this country from party politics, which enabled it to speak with united voice on questions of principle whilst allowing freedom to differ on matters of expediency. The Cambridge Summer School of Catholic Studies, which occupied the week following that of the C.S.G., was engaged on the subject of "Man," considered both naturally and supernaturally. The various papers read at this meeting will, when published later, be found very helpful in combating the dogmatic pseudo-science of the day. Again, taking advantage of the session of the British Medical Association at Eastbourne in late July, the Catholic doctors associated in the Guild of St. Luke held a meeting, in which medico-ethical problems were discussed, and the members encouraged both to add to their ranks and to take an active part in showing how Christian morality helps both bodily and mental health. A branch of the Association is to be started in Ireland and, we believe, the Catholic Medical Service in the United States is being organized on similar lines. It is computed that there are 3,000 Catholic doctors in this island.

This, then, is the sort of Catholic activity which the Pope wishes to flourish in every land, and the lack of which is largely accountable for the ill-fortunes of the Church amongst various peoples. It is simply a realization by the Catholic that the Faith is a talent not to be hidden in a napkin, that the Church he belongs to is engaged in a truceless war with the world, the flesh, and the devil, that he must, therefore, expect to meet with those adversaries at every turn, must equip himself with the armour so graphically described by St. Paul, and exert himself to defeat them; finally, that the fight must go on, even where the civil power is not in active league with his spiritual foes.

**Papal Regulation
of
Ecclesiastical
Sciences.**

A writer in our last issue recalled Cardinal Newman's praise of the "political detachment of the Popes," illustrated by Gregory XVI.'s preoccupation with the fortunes of the Foreign Missions when his own fortunes were grievously threatened by dis-

affection and sedition. Something of the same broad outlook is manifest in our present Holy Father's action in issuing, in the midst of unprecedented anxieties, an Apostolic Constitution, "Deus scientiarum Dominus," concerning higher ecclesiastical studies, and establishing, for the first time in the Church's history, a uniform standard by which, in future, courses and degrees in the sacred sciences are to be regulated. Hitherto, the innumerable institutions established in Rome and elsewhere to meet the multi-form needs of the Church, having been set up as occasion demanded without reference to each other, have naturally developed in isolation a certain want of equality in the conditions requisite for gaining their academic approval in their different branches. A strong Commission, composed of experts from various nations, Universities, and kinds of study, and charged with the task of preparing the ground for this Constitution, was formed early last year, and "took evidence," so to speak, from all parts of the world. Owing to political pre-occupations, this momentous document has, so far, attracted little attention, and, in a note like this, little can be said to display its importance, but its effect on the intellectual life of the Church, as we hope to show later, will be very great and very salutary.

THE EDITOR.

[NOTE.—The Rev. L. S. Lewis, whose booklet, "St. Joseph of Arimathea at Glastonbury," was adversely criticized by Father Thurston in the July MONTH, replies to one objection as follows: "Dean Robinson's 'unanswerable' theory was answered by me. It was not answered in 'St. Joseph of Arimathea at Glastonbury' which is published for a shilling. Space prevented. But the Dean was answered by me in a Foreword of 9 pages in the 2nd Edition of 'Glastonbury, the Mother of Saints—Her Saints, A.D. 37—1539,' expressly called 'Some answers to The Dean of Wells's 'Two Glastonbury Legends,'" and so advertised. I may add that in this contest with the Dean the Press upholds me."]

To this defence Father Thurston replies: "What I have said on p. 51 of THE MONTH is that 'Mr. Lewis when reprinting his pamphlet in 1927,' takes no notice of Dean Robinson's strictures. That statement is strictly accurate. When I say that he 'completely ignores' the Dean's refutation, a statement which occurs in the same context, I am obviously referring to the same popular booklet, the only one of his works mentioned in my article. What he may have said in the second edition of another and more expensive volume does not in the least concern me. My complaint is that his cheap and popular book is pushed into the hands of thousands, without one single word to suggest that the most eminent scholars of his own Church, producing overwhelming evidence, deny that there is a grain of truth or probability in the contention he advances."]

There the matter may be allowed to rest.—ED.

III. NOTES ON THE PRESS

[A summary survey of current periodicals with a view to recording useful articles which 1) expound Catholic doctrine and practice, 2) expose heresy and bigotry, and 3) are of general Catholic interest.]

CATHOLIC DOCTRINE AND PRACTICE.

Faith, What it is not [Rev. W. A. Spence in *Catholic Gazette*, Sept. 1931, p. 264].

Fascism, where contrary to Catholic teaching [Pius XI.: Encyclical, "Concerning Catholic Action"].

Mark's Gospel, Last Twelve Verses of [V. McNabb, O.P., in *Catholic Times*, June 26, 1931, p. 11].

Mass Stipend, The [P. Tanner in *Orate Fratres*, Aug. 9, 1931, p. 410].

Sex-Teaching, Why and in what sense condemned by Church [*Universe*, July 31, 1931, p. 12].

CATHOLIC DEFENCE.

"**Anglo-Catholic**" Shrines inaugurated [*Universe*, Aug. 21, 1931, p. 10].

Anti-Catholic revolution in Spain: Cardinal Segura's protest against, with details [*Tablet*, Aug. 22, 1931, p. 255].

Anti-clericalism in Ireland, inspired by Russia [*Catholic Times*, Aug. 21, 1931, p. 6; In Spain: *Universe*, Aug. 21, 1931, p. 1].

Bolshevism: how maintained [Bezimya in *Columba*, Aug. 1931, p. 239].

Catholicism assailed by Protestant societies [*Tablet*, Aug. 8, 1931, p. 169].

Catholic Doctrine, Misrepresentation of, in Liverpool Anglican Diocesan Magazine [*Tablet*, July 25, 1931, p. 105].

Columba, Spurious Oath attributed to "Knights of [W. S. Bishop in *Columba*, Aug. 1931, p. 249].

Lunn's, Sir H., Charge of Bigotry against the Cardinal, refuted [*Tablet*, Aug. 22, 1931, p. 233; *Catholic Times*, Aug. 21, 1931, pp. 1, 10].

Ouseley, "Ex-Monk" exposed [*Tablet* Aug. 8, 1931, p. 171].

Russian War against God, General Character of [C. M. Godden in *Tablet*, Aug. 22, 1931 p. 236; Nature of Five-Year Plan: T. A. Maguire in *Catholic Times*, July 24, 1931, p. 11].

Spain: Hypocrisy of Republicanism in [H. Belloc in *Universe*, Aug. 7, 1931, p. 7].

Willis, Canon, of Warrington: his claim to Continuity with Catholic Church [*Tablet*, Aug. 15, 1931, p. 205].

POINTS OF CATHOLIC INTEREST.

Agriculture. For Catholic Interest in [S. B. James in *Catholic Times*, July 31, Aug. 7, Aug. 14].

Agriculture v. Industrialism [W. J. Blyton in *Catholic Gazette*, Sept. 1931, p. 260].

History. In what sense should it be Catholic? [H. J. Parkinson in *Catholic Times*, Aug. 14, 1931, p. 9].

India, Religious Situation in [K. E. Job in *America*, July 4, 1931, p. 296].

Italy, Religious Education in [F. Zublena in *America*, July 4, 1931, p. 303].

Jesuit Martyrs in N. America [F. Noll, S.J., in *Dublin Review*, July 1931, p. 107].

Peace, Recent Catholic work for, in U.S.A. [E. Sweeney in *Commonweal*, March 11, 1931, p. 549].

REVIEWS

1—WASHINGTON DOCTORAL THESES¹

SISTER DIEDERICH'S erudite treatise was no doubt inspired by the recent Vergilian Millennium. If only as a tribute to the undying fame of Rome's national poet, her work will be welcome to a large circle of readers. The task she set herself and which she has carried out with much painstaking industry, was to illustrate by statistics Vergil's influence on Ambrosian style. All quotations and reminiscences of Mantua's bard have been hunted up in St. Ambrose's writings, sifted and carefully set forth with references. Incidentally, many passages utilized by the Saint from the Greek and Latin classics have been likewise incorporated into this work. A valuable feature is the brief but comprehensive notice of each of St. Ambrose's writings prefixed to the several quotation lists. In this way the reader readily finds his orientation, having at his disposal a miniature literary history of all Ambrose's works.

Much of these labours is of course mechanical; but the original appreciations testify to the compiler's exceptional acquaintance both with Vergil and St. Ambrose.

The purpose of Sister Getty's dissertation is "to describe life in North Africa as revealed in St. Augustine's Sermons." The task has involved enormous labour, seeing that some 363 *Sermones ad Populum* had to be ransacked and stripped of every allusion illustrative of life in the Roman colonies of North Africa in the late fourth and early fifth centuries. The harvest so laboriously garnered is exhibited in five sections, under the headings: I. Occupations and Professions. II. Amusements. III. Daily Life. IV. Christian Society in General. V. Superstitious Practices. For every detail occurring in the many subdivisions of these five principal parts, St. Augustine's own words are given in English in the body of the work; while the corresponding Latin texts are supplied in footnotes. This is a most valuable contribution to the study of St. Augustine's writings; and it should facilitate the reading of our great Western Doctor by

¹ (1) *Vergil in the Works of St. Ambrose*. By Sister M. Dorothea Diederich, D.Ph., of the Sisters of Notre Dame, Milwaukee, Wisconsin. (2) *The Life of the North Africans as revealed in the Sermons of St. Augustine*. By Sister M. Madel. Getty, D.Ph., of the Presentation of Mary, St. Hyacinth, Quebec. (3) *Étienne Du Trouchet. A Forzian Author of the 16th Century: A Biographical and Literary Study*. By Sister M. St. Francis Sullivan, D.Ph., of the Sisters of St. Joseph, Brighton, Mass. (4) *On a Case of the Triangles In-and-Circumscribed to a Rational Quartic Curve, with a Line of Symmetry*. By Sister Leonarda Burke, of the Sisters of St. Joseph, Brighton, Mass. Four treatises accepted by the Catholic University of America for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

supplying knowledge of necessary collateral matter otherwise not easily attainable.

Dr. Sullivan's work deserves the highest praise. The author is an American lady, a religious of the Sisters of St. Joseph; yet she writes with great facility and most learnedly in the most up-to-date idiomatic modern French. Had her treatise been presented to the University of Paris it could not have failed to win for her the title of Doctor of the Sorbonne!

The preparation of this able dissertation not only involved the reading of the long list of books entered in the bibliography, but it actually necessitated laborious research in several French libraries.

The subject of this monograph, Stephen Du Trouchet, seems to have enjoyed considerable fame in the sixteenth century. Subsequent in time to Rabelais and the Pleiad school of French poets, he is classed as belonging to the group known as Forezians. All these, it will be remembered, preceded Malesherbes, and accordingly were, by Boileau and the classical school, deemed unworthy of attention. But in these days of exhaustive and universal historical research, these early French writers have come by their own. They are studied as having played an important part in the development of the French language.

The thesis under consideration consists of three parts. The first supplies a minutely detailed biography of Du Trouchet. The second is an exhaustive study of his prose writings from both the historical and literary viewpoint. The third is wholly devoted to Du Trouchet's poems. The whole work is a credit to the department of modern languages in the Washington University.

Sister Burke's compressed dissertation on the Quartic Curve will appeal only to skilled mathematicians. It is satisfactory to find the Catholic University of America sharing in mathematical research work of the most advanced type. And still more satisfactory is it to find that learned nuns undergo such training under the direction of experts, as to enable them to participate in the progress of mathematical science.

J.D.

2—ONCE AGAIN, THE MAKING OF RELIGION¹

THE compendium of Father W. Schmidt's anthropological researches which is here presented to us is beyond question an extremely valuable book and one has only to compare it with two other translations of works of similar aim which have appeared about the same time—we refer to the revised edition

¹ *The Origin and Growth of Religion; Facts and Theories.* By W. Schmidt, Professor in the University of Vienna. Translated by Professor H. J. Rose. London: Methuen and Co. Pp. xvi. 302. Price, 15s. n. 1931.

of Salomon Reinach's "Orpheus" and to the "Primitive Man" of Cæsar de Vesme—to appreciate its great superiority in orderly method, thoroughness and breadth of view. We are glad to see that the fact that the author's conclusions do not in many respects accord with those of Dr. R. R. Marett, the Rector of Exeter College, Oxford, has not stood in the way of this Catholic work being included in Methuen's "Anthropological Series," for which Dr. Marett acts as editor. It is also a tribute to the representative character of the treatise that it has been rendered into English by so capable and conscientious a translator as Professor H. J. Rose. A translator of this type, who does not grudge an extra line or two to point out difficulties, and to explain on occasion his choice of a phrase, quoting at the same time the terms of the original, is as invaluable as he is rare. One infers that he must himself have suffered from unscrupulous renderings; and a confidence is created that even in cases of perplexity the English version may be trusted, without its being necessary to consult, probably at great inconvenience, a copy of the original text.

The great quality of Father Schmidt's work which makes it a handbook which every student will be glad to have at his elbow, is its range, its compression and its fair statement of opposing theories. As the translator, while dissociating himself from any necessary acceptance of the author's distinctive theories, has pointed out, Father Schmidt's "review of the whole history of the subject is remarkable alike for its completeness and its brevity." Very wisely this outline is prefixed to the more detailed treatment, and the writer's approach to the subject is throughout chronological, so far as that is possible. He discusses in order the Nature-Myth theory, Fetishism, Manism or Ghost-worship, Animism, Star-Myths (the "Panbabylonianism" of A. Jeremias), Totemism (under which section he deals with the Oedipus Complex of Sigmund Freud) and finally Magism and Dynamism. Then, in Part IV., we come to the discussion of that "vague and uncertain monotheism" which Father Schmidt considers to have prevailed among the pastoral nomads, one of the primary cultures, the great cattle-breeding peoples. Rejecting that form of primitive belief which has been identified with the term "sky god," he urges the claims of a fuller recognition of the supreme being which is shadowed in the designation "high god," and this constitutes the more substantial and constructive part of the whole treatise. To enter into the details of so complex a subject would be impossible in a notice like the present. The author agrees that the question, how the primitive high god and the religion of which he is the centre originated, cannot yet be adequately answered. But he considers that he has been able to demolish, one after another, those other theories, above

mentioned, of nature-myths, fetishism, animism, etc., and he sums up the matter briefly thus:

That the religion of the high god should owe its origin to any of these is impossible, as appears from two considerations. First, as all these theories teach, these elements could produce such a religion only as the last and highest stage of a long complicated process of evolutionary advance. But so far from being the latest of religions this one is characteristic of the oldest peoples. Secondly, such elements either are not to be found at all among these earliest peoples (they know neither totemism, fetish-worship nor animism) or only in a feeble form, as in the case of magic and ghost-worship; so weak a form that the powerful and conspicuous religion of the high god could not have been derived from them; while the fully-developed forms of these elements do not appear, as we have seen, until later cultures, those of the primary and secondary stages.

No doubt Father Schmidt's contention will continue to find many contraditors, as it has done in the past, but the reasoning and the facts marshalled on his side of the argument, are at least quite as reliable as those in the service of his opponents, and if the numerical majority of anthropologists is against him, the ingrained aversion of the "man of science" for anything which favours the standpoint of dogma or revelation may well account for this inequality. The really astonishing thing is that in spite of the paean of triumph which has so often been sung to celebrate the overthrow of the traditional Christian view of a primitive revelation, such a book as that before us can still command respect and force its gainsayers to make answer.

We must not omit to commend the excellent double index of subjects and authors, and also the copious bibliographical references which are to be found on almost every page.

SHORT NOTICES.

THEOLOGICAL.

THERE is no Note of the Church which those outside her fold more persistently try to explain away than her Unity, for, if that is an essential mark, then they who do not possess it are unchurched. An uneasy feeling that they are opposing Christ's purpose prompts the modern sects, whose founders so lightly discarded the idea, to try to regain what was then lost. It may be said that they now recognize Unity to have been Our Lord's design but through human frailty not hitherto successfully fulfilled. This is to ignore history, both past and present, and

also the fact that what Christ intended to be the chief motive of credibility in His Church cannot have been allowed to disappear. The Church has always been One, but her progress through the ages has been marked by constant defection from her membership. It is the present disunited state of Christendom, with the Church surrounded by the dead or dying branches which once belonged to her, that forms the initial sketch in a recent most valuable study—*l'Unité de l'Eglise du Christ* (La Bonne Presse: 12.00 fr.), by the Rev. Sidoine Hurtevent, A.A., wherein the whole subject is thoroughly investigated, both dogmatically and historically. Especially noteworthy is the section devoted to the Mystical Body and the variety which is compatible with its essential unity. The author, whose range of reading is very wide, discusses all the substitutes for the Catholic doctrine which the ingenuity of heresy has been able to devise and shows their entire insufficiency. His estimate of the Anglican position is sound, although a phrase on page xviii. might be taken to imply that the English Church has some vital connection with the pre-Reformation Catholic Church.

One is sometimes inclined to envy the Breton charcoal-burner, who, once satisfied that God speaks through His Church, accepts the divine teaching with unquestioning docility, when one contemplates the floods of theological literature which have their source in that act of acceptance. But in no point does "Faith seek understanding" more assiduously than in the investigation of its own nature; hence it was to be expected that the "Catholic Library of Religious Knowledge" should include a volume like the Rev. G. Brunhes' *Faith and its Rational Justification* (Sands: 3s. 6d. n.) in its contents. It will be found well worth its place. The absence of faith outside the Church is a portent of our time, caused largely by a misunderstanding of its nature. Accordingly it is of the first importance to show its thorough reasonableness and also to vindicate the share of the will in its genesis. The mind seeks truth and the will wants, or should want, truth; therefore, its influence is not illegitimate. But the supernatural character of Faith is even more important, for it is a divine gift and man has the power to render himself unfit to accept or retain it. All this is admirably expounded in the volume before us, the tone and spirit of which recommends it to the fair-minded enquirer.

MORAL.

The recent decrees of the Holy Office (March 18) condemning modern sex-instruction or sex-initiation, and also materialistic eugenism give especial point to two publications on our desk, *Sex Instruction* (Wagner, New York: Herder, London: 8s.), by Dr. James J. Walsh, and *State Sterilization of the Unfit* (B.O. and W.: 1s.), by Father H. Davis, S.J. Dr. Walsh's book has been written to assist parents and educators in the right discharge of a delicate and important duty. The difficulty arises from the fact that the removal of ignorance about sex-matters before the mind has grasped the motives, and the will acquired the habit, of self-control may easily result in temptation and sin. Yet to withhold knowledge when it is due, may cause worse trouble later. As not every parent or teacher has the tact or training necessary, Dr. Walsh's very full treatment of the subject, wherein he examines the

recurrent false theories of materialism and contrasts them with the sane psychology of the Christian, will prove of the greatest value.

Father Davis attacks a specific problem—how is the modern State to act in the face of the fact that amongst its citizens there is an increasing number mentally unfitted to fulfil the duties of good citizenship? The lethal chamber being ruled out as a remedy, may not the State, for the good of the community prevent by a surgical operation such members from propagating their kind? The answer given by Catholic theology is—No. That operation constitutes a grave mutilation such as can never be performed on the innocent, even with their consent, unless in circumstances which would call for the sacrifice of a limb—to preserve life. So Father Davis, guided by the authoritative teaching of the papal Encyclical on marriage, which in his opinion has removed the last shades of doubt from the true Catholic attitude. There is always the remedy of segregation, and there are unexplored possibilities in careful training.

A very valuable, full and well-documented treatment of the moral aspect of Eugenics has appeared as one of the series "Cahiers de la Nouvelle Journée" entitled *Eugénisme et Morale*, and written by Jordan, with supplements by various writers (Bloud and Gay: 2s.). A good deal of attention is given by the author to the eugenic movement in England, which is gathering considerable momentum and engaging the sympathy of increasing numbers outside the Church. The author of the book submits the movement to minute criticism in the various chapters on clinics and Neo-Malthusianism, the economic fallacy, pre-nuptial certificate of health, sterilization, a true eugenic, eugenics and social progress. The whole trend of the movement here is shown to be an implied admission that self-control is impossible, and the practice of the moral virtues by rational beings too heroic for this generation. So completely contrary are the interpretations of life by Catholics on the one hand and by the neo-pagan on the other. Students of the non-Catholic eugenic movement in search of a sound analysis of its shortcomings should read this book.

APOLOGETICAL.

A veteran worker in the lay Apostolate in the United States, Mr. David Goldstein, has put the weapons of his fervent zeal at the disposal of fellow workers by publishing a large volume, called *The Campaigners-for-Christ Handbook* (T. J. Flynn and Co., Boston: \$1.00), and containing the substance of his exposition of Catholicism arranged under convenient headings. Eleven years of this salutary work has made Mr. Goldstein very familiar with that complex of ignorance, error and (sometimes) mere malice, known as the non-Catholic mind, and he has brought the illumination of it to something like a fine art. Even the educated Catholic will find in these lively pages a host of interesting facts, collected from far-flung sources, and cleverly marshalled in defence of the Faith. The book will be very useful for our own Catholic Evidence Guild.

Father Paul Glenn, author of *Apologetics* (Herder: 9s.), does not hesitate to say that to-day Catholic Polemics are more necessary than mere Apologetics, since there is nothing new in the adversaries' attack

and they in turn should be put on their defence. But he owns that there is no effective attack unless the defence is secure and he devotes himself to provide that definite and logical exposition of the "Catholic Thing," in a class-book for students, which will enable them, as long as men retain their reasons, to justify argumentatively their beliefs. To-day the apologist has to go right down to fundamentals; hence Father Glenn treats, in four sections, of God's Existence, Attributes and Action on the World, of Religion and the Supernatural, of Christ, God Incarnate and Redeemer, and finally of The Church. The treatment is scholarly and, considering the need of compression, thoroughly adequate.

BIBLICAL.

The Scriptures have often been translated into modern speech with a view to making their meaning clearer; Mr. Thomas Derrick in his **The Prodigal Son and Other Parables shown in Pictures** (Blackwell: 7s. 6d. n.) has aimed at setting the story of some five of the parables—the Prodigal, the Unjust Steward, the Two Sons, the Pharisee and the Publican, and the Good Samaritan—in modern dress and surroundings. The drawings, in bold outline with a minimum of detail, yet indicate very cleverly and without any irreverence, the *nuances* of the several tales. The illustrations of the Good Samaritan, who is represented as a commercial traveller in a motor-car stocked with samples, are perhaps the most striking.

St. Paul, the most directly "inspired" of all the Apostles, has proved an inexhaustible mine of theology for every age. We cannot yet maintain that all the implications of his teaching have been elucidated by commentators. Certainly the Rev. J. M. Bover, S.J., in his **Three Studies from St. Paul** (B.O. and W.: 3s. 6d.), translated from the Spanish by M. O'Leary has developed certain unfamiliar aspects of it. His first "study" shows how devotion to the Sacred Heart, even as so wonderfully expanded to-day is to be found flowering in the thought of St. Paul. The second represents the Apostle as the subject and witness of that Mystical Union with God granted to many of the Saints. The third is a more familiar doctrine, developing that pregnant saying "the Fullness of Christ," the immense idea repeated in so many strained phrases, dark as it were with excess of light. Father Bover is a competent theologian yet does not obscure his treatise with technicalities. It will be read with profit and edification by the devout. We are glad that the translator with great gain to clearness has used the "Westminster Version" in quotations.

The third volume of the series, **At the Feet of the Divine Master, Meditations for busy Parish Priests**, by Rev. Anthony Huonder, S.J., freely adapted into English by August F. Brockland (Herder: 8s.), treats of the Resurrection and the Manifestations in the Risen Life, with three other chapters on the Ascension, the Descent of the Holy Ghost, and Christ's Life in the Church. We assume, therefore, that this concludes the series, the first of which was noticed in **THE MONTH** for August 1927. The introductory meditations on the soul's longing for complete joy and consummation, on the mystery of the Resurrection, and on the tendency of modern unbelief to discountenance it, are excellently drawn out. The whole series is worked on the same lines as before,

in good divisions and sub-divisions, the author allowing his mind to dwell on the soul-aspects of the characters that occur in the drama. There is a marked acquaintance with Scripture underneath this psychological commentary. Moreover, the meditations are given in a narrative form, many ideas of the author's own being blended into the Scripture story. All through the book the priest is kept in mind, and reflections on his life and responsibilities are often introduced. But the book is not merely for priests; it is of use to the layman also.

DEVOTIONAL.

Father Frederick Houck is already well known to us as a writer making good use of the argument from design. Many will remember his earlier works: "Our Palace Wonderful," and "The Palace Beautiful." In his last: *Fountains of Joy, or, By Water and Blood* (Herder: \$2.00 n.), he pursues the same subject in an interesting and somewhat original manner. He begins with a discussion of water itself, and the part which it plays in the life of this world. Thence he passes on to the sacramental water, and its place in the spiritual life of the Church. Lastly, using the text "By water and blood," he goes on to that Living Water which is the Blood of Christ, and Its part in the sacramental life and the devotion of the Church. Father Houck has an easy and attractive way of uniting the natural with the supernatural, making the world and the skies proclaim the glory of God. This volume is in some ways deeper than others of his works, but it is not less fascinating. His material is not erudite; much we may say we knew before, but it is the way he puts it that turns science and art into spiritual reading.

HISTORICAL.

Those who wish to interest themselves, and perhaps still more to interest others, in the work in the Foreign Mission field, could scarcely do better than read *The Golden Legend Overseas* (B.O. and W.: 6s.), edited by Maurice Vaussard and translated from the French by Warre B. Wells. It is a wonderful collection, written by various authors, of the accounts of fourteen striking romances of missionary life. Among the authors are such well known names as Père Charles, S.J., Georges Goyau, Henri Ghéon and the like. They tell us, for the most part, of less known, but in some sense more remarkable, martyrs and missionaries, in Mexico, Paraguay, North America, Japan, India, Annam, Abyssinia, Uganda and Armenia; in other words they cover the main field in almost every part of the world. The method of the writers is narrative and, in a sense, impressionist, but all give us the general lesson of the intense human devotion displayed on the mission field, both by the missionaries and by their heroic converts. Many readers, we imagine, will be most attracted by the last of these stories, entitled "The Martyrdom of the Opium Smoker." For ourselves we were particularly struck by the beautiful stories of the Iroquois savage, Kateri Tekakwitha and of the apostle of Ceylon, Father Joseph Vaz.

With commendable enterprise the Herder Book Company has determined to bring before English readers the Abbé F. Mourret's *Histoire de l'Eglise*, an up-to-date work in ten volumes of much erudition and

value. The translation is from the pen of Father Newton Thompson, already well known from his version of Fillion's "Life of Christ," and the fifth volume, dealing with the Renaissance, the Protestant Revolt and the Catholic Reformation, has been chosen to inaugurate the series. The forces let loose in that troubled period are still fiercely contending in our midst. The spiritual power of the Papacy was never greater than to-day, whilst, on the other hand, anti-Christ has set up his throne in Russia. The Abbé Mourret's lucid pages, which discuss, not only outward events but the inward development of principles, enable us to see the present in the past, and so understand it better. We are naturally more interested in his account of the change of religion in this country, which, though necessarily very brief yet manages with fair accuracy to trace the convolutions of that tangled tale. More might, we think, have been said about the English Martyrs; more about the essential Protestantism of Elizabeth's Church, but it is consoling to know that our ecclesiastical history is not misunderstood in this scholarly work. In the bibliography, carefully compiled from the notes by the translator, the literature of the past ten years is unnoticed; in view of its range and importance, to include that literature would have added much to the book's usefulness.

Last May, we noticed the first volume of Father Charles Hart's *The Student's Church History* (B.O. and W.: 3s. 6d.), which ended with the Conversion of Constantine. The author then hoped to confine the work to three volumes but he finds now that his subject cannot be adequately treated in less than four. The second volume accordingly reaches as far as the transference of the Holy Roman Empire to Otho I. of Germany (962). The period vividly illustrates those parables of Our Lord which represent His Church as embracing the good and the evil, for it is filled with the troubles arising from obstinate heretics, Arius, Photius and the rest, which troubles caused various definitions of doctrine. Father Hart enlivens his pages with contemporary anecdotes and conveys incidentally a good deal of religious instruction.

Madame Forbes, author of a fact-book of Church History called *The Church in the World* (Longmans: three parts, 1s. each), has issued three parts in one, priced 3s. It will be found useful as a guide to fuller studies, which are indicated in adequate bibliographies, and as a means of recalling the broad outlines of an enormous intellectual territory.

The belief that the present Anglican Establishment, the result of the Elizabethan "Settlement of Religion," is essentially one with the Church which it supplanted, a Church which considered the Pope as the Vicar of Christ and the Mass as the central act of Christian worship, must logically regard these dogmas, and many others almost equally important, as not essentially Catholic. Believers in "Continuity" must further hold that the pre-Elizabethan Church in England was wrong in thinking these doctrines to belong to the essence of Catholicism: in other words, "that the Church of Rome (in England and elsewhere) had erred . . . in matters of faith." They claim therefore, identity with a fallible Church, now purged of its errors. Thus they hope to evade the arguments of Catholics who point out the enormous and fundamental differences in doctrine, worship and discipline, between Elizabeth's foundation and the English Church in Mary's reign. They grant the

differences but deny that they are essential. Blinded by this colossal prejudice, they will read Father Rope's **Matthew Parker's Witness Against Continuity** (B.O. and W.: 2s. 6d.), the testimony, drawn mainly from his letters, of the first Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury, to the radical change of religion effected by Cecil and his colleagues, with withers unprung. Their ignorance of the true nature of the Church of Christ makes them impervious to argument. In their eyes, Mary's Church was the Church of Christ unreformed: Elizabeth's, the Church of Christ reformed: all else is irrelevant. But to those who know that the gates of hell cannot prevail against Christ's Church, which is a truth of faith, and that the identity of one religious community with another, both claiming the same founder, must primarily consist in identity of doctrine, which is a truth of reason, Father Rope's thorough and devastating exposition of Parker's thorough Protestantism comes as an additional proof of the man-made character of Anglicanism. For the first time in Christian history a lay person or persons—"The Crown"—pretended to be the source of spiritual and ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and the fact that Elizabeth's bishops all confessed their indebtedness to the Crown for any jurisdiction that they had or exercised destroys any claim their successors may make to Apostolical succession. These obvious facts would not need stressing by Father Rope, were it not that Anglican historians, like Bishop Frere, seem bent on ignoring them.

The three great "Labour" books of Mr. and Mrs. Hammond, which describe with a magisterial array of evidence the Condition of the Town-, the Village-, and the Skilled-Labourer respectively, during the period of the Industrial Revolution—the sixty years which immediately preceded the Reform Bill of 1832—have, we may suppose, done more to shatter the unChristian economics of the Manchester School in modern minds than libraries of kindred literature. For they were written with a fine sense of justice and a wealth of human sympathy which made them as moving as a great drama. The same qualities are to be seen in their latest study, **The Age of the Chartists** (Longmans: 12s. 6d. n.), which deals with the twenty-two years between 1832 and 1854, and endeavours to show the forces at work to restrain and regulate, with indifferent success, the spirit of unChristian selfishness let loose by industrialism. With what reluctance, stimulated by growing discontent and revolt, did the legislature strive to remedy economic ills directly due to the false social philosophy in which it still believed. The inhuman treatment of the poor, the oppression of the wage-earner; the concentration into city slums, their deprivation of access to commons increasingly enclosed, the starving of Church schools by the State—for even then dissent was venomously opposed to fair treatment,—the ravages of cheap drink; all this is described with that wealth of documentation characteristic of the authors; it would serve as a lurid comment on the recent social teaching of the Popes. Then the agitation of the Chartists, the growth of Trade Unionism, the spread of popular education, and a strong humanitarianism evoked by the very miseries which the false economics caused, gradually raised the standard of living and set about the removal of the worst abuses. But they remain in germ and can never be completely eradicated until covetousness is brought under the

control of the moral law. This is emphatically a book for social study clubs.

SOCIOLOGY.

The title which Father John A. McClorey, S.J., gives to his seven sociological lectures, *The Catholic Church and Bolshevism* (Herder Book Co.: 3s. 6d.), is to this extent misleading that the "Bolshevism" he has in view is not confined to Russia but stands for the materialist conception of industry everywhere, which has unhappily been accentuated by the world-war. Then all the finer elements of civilization were discarded and the world sank to the level of the jungle—intellect, courage, skill, only serving to make the struggle more deadly and prolonged. The same mad antagonism survives in the social and international competition for wealth which perpetuates the economic chaos produced by the war. Father McClorey is no pessimist but he denounces unsparely the cupidity both of rich and poor, the futile remedy of socialism, the misuse of machinery, the misguided intervention or abstention of the State. The lectures were obviously addresses in Church and suffer a little from rhetorical emphasis, but they are a stirring plea for a restoration of a Christian order.

It is a common-place of criticism to say that, if all Catholics especially where they are a majority, realized and performed their duties as citizens our social evils would be much alleviated. For the faith provides clear principles of justice and charity which, reduced to action, have an immense influence in Christianizing human intercourse. Those principles may be found clearly developed in Père Yves de la Brière's booklet *Quels sont nos devoirs envers la Cité?* (Flammarion: 5.50 fr.), wherein are discussed the relations between social justice and Christian charity, *i.e.*, the Catholic attitude towards the problems of industry; then the Catholic conception of the obligations of patriotism; further, how nations should regard and treat their fellow-nations; and finally the ideal relations between Church and State. All these are burning topics to-day, and Père de la Brière has done Catholics a great service in explaining them so lucidly.

MISCELLANEOUS.

An interesting essay in modern criticism: *Psychology in the New Literature*, by Rev. F. Kearney, S.J. (Louisville Press: \$1.00), covers for the most part some of the French writers of to-day and some leading Americans. Not that writers from England and Ireland are by any means omitted, but, obviously, the author has mainly in mind his own immediate surroundings. He has grouped together various authors into certain classes, who are looking at life for the most part from the rationalistic standpoint. On the other hand, and in contrast with these, he proclaims the dignity of such men as Paul Claudel, Bremond and Paul Bourget. He gives us some excellent generalizations for our guidance in reading modern free-lances. Not the least interesting of his studies is that of Eugene O'Neill, whose name has become recently prominent in London. He allows the man's genius, but he puts his finger accurately on the point where he has gone astray.

A new series of books on Education, "Comment: Problèmes d'Educa-

tion," has opened with **Comment Former Des Hommes**, by Abbé Henri Pradel, Director of L'Ecole Massillon, in Paris (Desclée: 10.00 fr.). It is an instructive volume on the virtue of obedience, divided into three parts: Obedience in relation to education; the office of commanding, and the taste for effort. The latter two parts of this book, in particular, seem to us very valuable, and, of these two, especially the one giving advice to those who command. The volume is very carefully subdivided, with headings to every section; this alone providing abundance of material for instruction on obedience in its many forms. The trend of the book is to make obedience an attractive virtue.

Father Rope, who may be regarded as the poet, or one of the poets, of the English Catholic Rural Revival, and who naturally dedicates his book to Father Vincent McNabb, the philosopher of the same wholesome movement, has collected a number of his essays bearing more or less directly on that subject in a charming volume called **Forgotten England** (Heath Cranton: 4s. 6d. n.). Mr. D. B. Wyndham Lewis describes the underlying purpose of the book in a Preface both profound and witty. Although Father Rope's language and tone regarding the effects, social and moral, of modern industry are apt to be over-bitter, he has hit upon the fundamental evil of our times—the worship of this world which results appropriately in inability to appreciate its real worth—and he is right in denouncing it unsparingly. Lovers of Catholic England will delight in his book.

Mr. Peter F. Anson has repeated the success achieved by his pen-and-pencil-description of the fisheries of the east coast of Scotland in a similar volume called **Mariners of Brittany** (Dent: 12s. 6d. n.), an account full of knowledge and sympathy of the Breton fisher-folk, and their ways, afloat and ashore. The author follows the coastline of that deeply-indented promontory of N.E. France, from St. Malo to the mouth of the Loire, noting the peculiarities of the coastal towns and villages, and of the various craft they harbour. His wonderfully-skilled draughtsmanship enables us to visualize the different vessels devoted to the cod, sardine and tunny fisheries and the picturesque bays and estuaries wherein they shelter. Much also is told of the mysterious Breton folk, their piety, their bravery, their many superstitions. The book will be much appreciated by the growing crowds of visitors to Brittany, the more so that it preserves many features which that very popularity is gradually destroying.

REPRINTS.

Now that universal disarmament is in the air there is much danger of its remaining there unless marked progress is made in moral disarmament, the replacing of national egotism and distrust by a sense of world solidarity inspired by Christianity. Therefore we welcome a cheap reprint of Mr. John Oxenham's stirring story—**The Man who would Save the World** (Longmans: 1s. n.)—which has that transformation for theme and object, and argues it very persuasively.

We hope the ambiguous title to Father Knox's collection of sparkling little newspaper essays, **An Open-Air Pulpit** (Constable: 2s. 6d. n.), will not prevent a wider public from enjoying it, now that it is issued in a cheaper edition. The humour is genuine and there is generally a serious thought or two in each paper to which it adds force.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Reviewed in present issue or reserved for future notice.)

AMERICA PRESS, New York.

Catholic Culture in Alabama. By Michael Kenny, S.J. Pp. 410. Price, \$5.00.

BEAUCHESNE, Paris.

Les Origines de l'Eucharistie, Sacrement et Sacrifice. By Werner Goossens. Pp. xxiv. 394. Price, 50.00 fr. *La Doctrine Ascétique des Premiers Maîtres Egyptiens.* By P. Resch, D.D. Pp. xxxviii. 286. Price, 32.00 fr.

BRUCE PUBLISHING CO., Milwaukee.

New Lights on Pastoral Problems. By Paul Hanly Fursey. Pp. 106. xvi. *Religious Men and Women in Church Law.* Pp. xvi. 271. *God's Minutemen.* By J. E. Moffatt, S.J. Pp. 182. Price, \$1.35.

BURNS, OATES & WASHBOURNE, London.

The Lives of the Saints. Vol. III. March. A New Edition. Corrected, Amplified and Edited by Herbert Thurston, S.J. and Norah Leeson. Pp. viii. 460. Price, 7s. 6d. n. *Spiritism: Its Failure.* By P. J. Gearon, O.C.C. Pp. 152. Price, 3s. 6d.

CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA, Washington, D.C.

The Vocabulary of Hegesippus. By W. F. Dwyer, S.S. Pp. xv. 200.

CECIL PALMER, London.

The Golden Thurible. By Wilfred Rowland Childe. Pp. 79. Price, 5s.

CONSTABLE & CO., London.

A Book of Medieval Latin for Schools. By Helen Waddell. Pp. viii. 85. Price, 2s. 6d. n.

DESCLEE DE BROUWER, Paris.

Morale et Politique. By Joseph Viatoux. Pp. 138. Price, 10.00 fr. *La Juridiction de l'Eglise sur la Cité.* By Charles Journet. Pp. 232. Price, 12.00 fr. *Les Philosophies Indiennes.* By René Grousset. Tome I. Pp. xviii. 344. Tome II. Pp. 416.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS, Cambridge, Mass.

An Essay Concerning the Understanding, Knowledge, Opinion, and Assent. By John Locke. Edited, with an Introduction, by Benjamin Rand, Ph.D., LL.D. Pp. lx. 306. Price, 15s.

HERDER, London.

Moral Values and Moral Life. By Etienne Gilson. Translated by Leo Richard Ward, C.S.C. Pp. 337. Price, 10s.

"LA CITE CHRETIENNE," Brussels.

Le Retour à Jésus. Essais de Morale Catholique. I. By l'Abbé Jacques Leclercq. Pp. 376. Price, 25.00 fr.

LA "CIVILTA CATTOLICA," Naples.

La Lettera di Aristeo à Filocrate. By Raffaele Tramontano, S.J. With a Preface by R. P. Alberto Vaccari. Pp. xvi. 208 and 266. Price, 50 l.

LONGMANS, London.

Christ's Message to Us To-day. By Rev. W. P. G. McCormick. Pp. vii. 63. Price, 2s. n.

SHEED & WARD, London.

The Nature of Belief. By M. C. D'Arcy, S.J. Pp. 336. Price, 7s. 6d. *March. Kind Comrade.* By R. H. J. Steuart, S.J. Pp. xi. 261. Price, 7s. 6d.

SHELDON PRESS, London.

Studies in Early Mysticism in the Near and Middle East. By Margaret Smith, M.A., Ph.D. Pp. x. 276. Price, 12s. 6d. n.

TEQUI, Paris.

La Royauté du Christ. By Dom L. Chambat, O.S.B. Pp. xiv. 74. Price, 5.00 fr. *L'Ame d'un Prêtre.* By E. Laveille, S.J. Pp. xix. 277. Price, 12.00 fr.

THE FRANCISCAN PRESS, Wuchang.

The Triple Demism of Sun Yat-Sen. Trans. by Pascal M. D'Elia, S.J. Pp. xxxvii. 747. Price, \$1.75.

